

## LEONARD LESSIUS

**L** EONARDUS LESSIUS, in Flemish, Leendert Leys, was born at Brecht (Antwerp), the 1st of October, 1554, two years before Philip II., king of Spain, granted legal existence to the Jesuits in Belgium. He was only six years old when he lost his father and mother, and learnt thus young the transient nature of earthly things. Yet relations took care of the orphan and provided him with a home.

As he was a very serious and studious boy, his schoolfellows called him the little prophet. At one period his family tried to induce him to give up his studies and learn a trade, his father's savings being nearly exhausted. But, after a good deal of entreaty, he succeeded in persuading his uncle to continue his education, and went on studying, at the cost of many hardships. Thus he often had to warm his numbed hands at the candle whose burning, his uncle told him, should determine the length of his study.

When he was thirteen the respite came to an end. Leonard now knew his arithmetic and was eligible for the clerkship that awaited him, according to his uncle's plan, at Antwerp. But just before he was to take up a mercantile career, a scholarship became providentially available at the university of Louvain, to which a Brecht student was entitled to the first claim. Lessius competed for it and won.

Although to start with he knew but the elements of classics, he was able to finish his humanities in two years, and then he took up the study of philosophy, a much more inviting field of study for the eager youth. An intellect, at once acute and profound, a wonderful power of concentration, a well-balanced and sober judgment, great originality, were even now characteristic of his mental equipment. During his philosophical studies, he made the acquaintance of the Jesuits of Louvain, and was much impressed alike by their learning and their humility. He seems to have struck up a friendship with the lay-brother porter of the Jesuit residence, whose wise conversation turned his thoughts to higher than mere earthly learning. And so he conceived a desire of entering the Society. At the end of his philosophy course, there was a public competitive display, to which much im-

portance was attached. Amidst a group of a hundred and fifty contestants Lessius secured the first prize at the age of seventeen, and thus became eligible for the most honourable and most lucrative offices in the country. Elaborate banquets were given in his honour at Brecht and at Louvain, and the famous Michael Baius,<sup>1</sup> professor of theology at the university of Louvain, took especial notice of the young scholar. Baius had already come under censure for philosophical heresies at Rome, and had been publicly refuted by Bellarmine<sup>2</sup> on their account. He was not pleased, naturally enough, with the brilliant young scholar's inclinations towards the Society, and tried very hard to induce him to attend his own lectures. Moreover, Leonard's aspirations met with resistance from his own kinsmen, who were not too delighted with his intended abandonment of a promising career, just when everything pointed to a prosperous future.

It must have been very hard for the young man to hold fast to his first decision. However, his determination prevailed, and he entered the Jesuit noviceship at Louvain on the 24th June, 1572. Being forced to leave the city, during the invasion of the troops of the prince of Orange, he ended his noviceship at St. Omer over the French border.

Nothing very noticeable is recorded of his formation period. His supremely logical mind found in the sublime philosophy of the Spiritual Exercises a wide and unclouded outlook on life which he never lost. From that time forward he became the tireless servant of God, without exaggeration, without singularity, aiming at no servile imitation of stereotyped holiness, but an independent, calm development of solid virtue. If there are any tendencies towards mysticism to be found in his later books,<sup>3</sup> it is probably owing to the influence of the works of Ruysbroeck and Thauler, which he was allowed to read even when he was a novice.

After his noviceship, Lessius hoped to take up his studies again, but he was appointed professor of philosophy at Douai, although he was only twenty years of age. His pupils

<sup>1</sup> Michael Baius, born at Melin (Brabant) in 1513, died in 1588. He submitted to the decrees of the Holy See. Some of his false theories were resumed by Jansenius.

<sup>2</sup> Robert Bellarmine was born at Montepulciano, in Italy, in 1542. He preached and lectured at Louvain from 1569 to 1576, and died at Rome in 1621. He was beatified by Pius XI. in May, 1923.

<sup>3</sup> Among his spiritual works may be mentioned *De Summo Bono et aeterna beatitudine hominis, libri quatuor, ad I-II<sup>a</sup> S. Thomæ*, and *De perfectionibus moribusque divinis libri XIV*, which contains the well-known "Recollectiones precatiorie," and "Quinquaginta nomina Dei."

related that they never heard a master, so clear, simple and personal in his teaching. He hated manuals. The best way of studying successfully, he said, was to read the great mediæval masters, to meditate on them and so to develop a personal idea of their value born of private study.

The young professor used his free time to fill up the voids left by his early education. His eagerness to learn gave him no rest. His nephew, who wrote *De vita et moribus Lessii*, tells us of a fact which is almost incredible. One day, he felt profoundly humiliated because he was so unproficient in Greek, and there and then decided to master the language perfectly. After two months' application, he was able to translate Aristotle with ease! It is said, moreover, that to keep in practice he used to translate in his mind into Greek what was read in the refectory during meals.

His medical science was quite extraordinary for the time, as attests his *Hygiasticon*.<sup>1</sup> He was led to study that branch of learning on account of a dire disease which he caught during his flight from Douai, whence, during one of the religious upheavals of the time, the Jesuits had been driven by the Calvinists. Lessius and his companion put up during the journey at a certain inn infected with a sort of plague. They awoke at midnight burning with fever, and, after a few days, scrofulous tumours appeared upon their bodies. Lessius' companion died after two months. He himself came safely through the first crisis; but he never finally got rid of the painful complaint which little could be done to alleviate. He bore his sufferings patiently, asking God for the grace to suffer with profit and edification, if he was not to be cured.

After he had got over the first and severest onset of the malady he resumed his lectures, until he was called to Rome to complete his philosophical and theological education under the guidance of Francis Suarez.<sup>2</sup> It was not long before Lessius gained the esteem and the trust of the celebrated master. They became friends and confidants. One day Suarez told him that he (Lessius) accommodated himself too easily to the opinions of his masters. It was all very

<sup>1</sup> *Hygiasticon seu vera ratio valetudinis bonæ et vitæ, una cum sensuum, iudicii et memoriæ integritate, ad extremam senectutem servandæ*. An essay, both medical and moral. It met with enormous success. There exist at least thirty-two editions, published in Latin, English, Spanish, Flemish, French, Italian and Polish.

<sup>2</sup> Franciscus Suarez, S.J., born in Grenada in 1548, called by Benedict XIV. "lumen theologiæ." He wrote twenty-three folio volumes, and died at Lisbon in 1617.

well to be submissive and docile, but there was such a thing as thinking for oneself. The Church, provided always due regard was paid to ascertained truth and established tradition, encouraged discussion and speculation. Suarez probably did not suspect on what fertile soil his admonitions fell. Lessius, being a true Fleming, was ready enough to think for himself, but hitherto his natural independence had been subdued only by his over-rigid interpretation of St. Ignatius' rules. Now, having been invited to exercise that independence, he began to do so, and Suarez was soon to experience that even in most important matters, his pupil could take and keep a position quite opposite to his.<sup>1</sup>

Lessius left Rome after a two years' stay, and was appointed professor of theology at the Collegium Maximum of his Province at Louvain. Here starts the most brilliant period in his career, during which he took rank among the most celebrated theologians in the Society and in the Church. People came from all parts of Europe to consult him. Justus Lipsius<sup>2</sup> frequently called on him. After Lessius' death, Urban VIII. attested: "I knew Lessius quite well; he was a great friend of mine. He was a very learned man; but I admire him especially on account of his virtues. He was uncommonly humble and pious; therefore I consider him as a great saint in heaven." Vasquez and Molina wrote frequently to him. The Archduke Albert looked upon him as the most learned jurist and moralist of his time, and highly esteemed his *De Justitia et Jure*.<sup>3</sup> St. Charles Borromeo wished that every confessor should have that book at hand. St. Francis of Sales held him in great respect, and was in complete agreement with his theory on grace. Paul V. was

<sup>1</sup> The main point of the famous dispute which arose between them in 1588 and lasted until 1607, forms the crux of all speculative theology: How to reconcile free will and grace—a problem which has divided the theological world to this day.

<sup>2</sup> Justus Lipsius was born at Overryssche (Brussels) in 1547. In his early years he inclined to protestantism, but he returned very soon to orthodoxy. There is no need to enumerate his literary and philological works. He became a bosom friend of Lessius, in whose arms he died in 1606.

<sup>3</sup> *De Justitia et Jure* (1605). The best known work of Lessius. It is a commentary on a part of the II-IIæ of St. Thomas. Perhaps the most interesting questions of the whole treatise are those which arise in connection with the discovery of America, and the institution of the banker's profession. Lessius treats them from a moral point of view, with a thoroughness and a firmness, quite new at that time. Twenty editions were issued from 1605 to 1734. The world is waiting for a Catholic theologian who will emulate Lessius in dealing as a master with the modern world of commerce and industry in the light of Christian principles.



prepared to confer ecclesiastical dignity upon him on account of his services to the Church.<sup>1</sup>

His lectures enjoyed a great popularity as may be gathered from the following words of his biographer, "What he once had thought out and determined, he set forth in speech or writing with wonderful clearness, brevity and distinction, so that his peculiar glory seems to consist in uniting lucidity with subtlety, brevity with lucidity, teaching with brevity." The brevity here spoken of must be understood relatively. At that time a two volume folio was considered to be very concise, accustomed as people were to works in ten and twenty volumes. Brevity and thoroughness were generally held to be incompatible with each other. This is illustrated by the fact that Lessius' *De Justitia et Jure*, although it acquired unequalled celebrity in most parts of Europe, was not appreciated in Spain for a long time because of comparative shortness.

But popularity, especially in a university town, may sometimes have its drawbacks. Lessius, as we have said, was an original thinker, and though it is possible to be both original and orthodox, there are always some who deny that possibility. The notes of his pupils spread Lessius' lectures throughout the university, and excited comment amongst rival professors. Baius, smarting under the censure of Bellarmine, was especially prone to find fault with Bellarmine's colleague, and he, with others, collected some thirty-four propositions, purporting to be taught by Lessius, and had them censured by the Archbishops of Malines and Cambrai and other prelates. Lessius took no steps to vindicate himself at home, but sent a justification to the Holy See. Other authorities joined the fray on his side, notably the theological colleges of Mainz, Trier and Ingoldstadt, as also several Belgian bishops, and the dispute, after the manner of theological contests, grew so hot and violent that the Pope, Sixtus V., had to send a legate to impose silence on the parties, meanwhile deciding that the theses as explained by their author were sound doctrine. During the whole debate, which upset the country, not a single harsh word can be imputed to Lessius. Always

<sup>1</sup> His best known apologetic work is *Quæ fides et quæ religio sit capessenda consultatio* (1609), an answer to a widespread Protestant principle: that creed is a matter of comparative indifference. There exist at least 41 editions, 14 Latin, 8 German, 4 Flemish, 5 French, 7 Polish, 1 English, 1 Arabic, 1 Italian.

courteous in speech and writing, he manifested great self-command and an uncommon humility, although he was by nature rather excitable than meek. Moreover, he frankly admitted the merits of those who disagreed with him, and avoided personalities of every kind, being whole-hearted in the pursuit of truth.

He, whom people used to call "the oracle of the Netherlands," did not disdain to discuss matters with his disciples. He sought for light from every source, and was successful because pride did not blind his intellect. His self-knowledge compelled him to refuse an appointment as Superior for which he felt he was unsuited. He never published anything, although whatever he wrote was sure of a large and admiring public, except under the express orders of his Superior. One of his colleagues, asked to give an opinion on the advisability of printing one of his works, wrote, "Whenever I consult Lessius' notes, I feel that their publication would be much to the credit of our country and our society. Others have treated the same matters, but they do not satisfy the claims of sharper and more philosophical intellects. To my thinking, Lessius should be charged to comment on the whole *Summa*; we should thus possess in a few books a complete theology treated in a scientific, practical and clear way." The opinion of the well-known Scripture scholar, Cornelius a Lapide, corroborated this statement. Lessius could resist no longer, and began to prepare a complete edition of his works. But even then his wish was that they might be produced anonymously, but the authorities rejected his appeal, probably on the score that anonymity could not screen this particular author.

Even more characteristic than his humility was his angelical patience in his sufferings. As we have implied from his 24th year, he never had a moment without pain. In addition to the malady that assailed him then, many other kinds of disease, the most excruciating and the most nauseous, were his share. They cannot be described in any detail, but it was plain that God alone kept life in his emaciated and tortured frame. Only divine love could have inspired his exclamation in a violent crisis of agony—"O Lord, who am I that you have chosen me to suffer so much. I will always thank you." "God," he used to say, "will repay me this little trial." As long as he could offer Mass or receive Holy Communion, all sufferings seemed bearable to

him. Only twice, in three years of unutterable pains, did he miss Communion; excessive night perspiration forced him to quench his burning thirst. He spent daily two hours in preparation for Holy Mass, and two in thanksgiving. Many people were eager to attend his Mass, so inspiring was the devotion expressed in countenance and attitude. He sometimes came back from the altar completely exhausted, and often the place where he stood was marked with blood.

Strengthened then by a supernatural force alone, he was able to accomplish his daily toils. He ate only once a day, two eggs with a bit of bread; he never drank wine. Bound to conform to a very strict dietary, he made a virtue of necessity. He used to quote himself as an example to show what even a delicate man is capable of doing, provided he be moderate. He taught theology during fifteen years, was prefect of studies during twenty-three, wrote his books, gave catechetical instructions, heard confessions, was present at two General Congregations as delegate of the Flemish-Belgian Province, used every moment of time profitably to the very end of his life, until a last and most excruciating disease, the stone, confined him to bed. The night before his death he endured in patience a most violent thirst, that he might receive Holy Communion at four o'clock. At nine in the morning on January 15, 1623, he wished to take some rest; a quarter of an hour later he died suddenly.

Three hundred and one years have passed since that great soul went to God. He is not forgotten like the millions of his contemporaries. He lives in his books which are still the admiration of the scholar, but still more he lives in the devotion of the faithful. The cause of his Beatification has been introduced.<sup>1</sup>

TH. HEYRMAN.

<sup>1</sup> The bones of Lessius are reverently kept in a marble tomb erected on the right handside of the choir of the Jesuit church at Louvain. On the tombstone are written the following words: "Ossa S. D. Leonardi Lessii S.J. Obijt Lovanii XV Jan. A. MDCXXIII. The Tercentenary of his death, January, 1923, was made the occasion of the publication in Flemish of an excellent and exhaustive biography by Ch. Van. Sull, S.J.

## THE TRUE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE CISTERCIANS

**I**T is matter for reflection that alone of England's many great kings the one who has been singled out for the honoured title of "The Great" was a man who was in no sense a monarch and whose achievements were small, concerned only with one of four provincial kingdoms and with no ultimate influence on the world's history. Not that one would belittle Alfred the Great, for it must be owned that his achievements were outstanding in this—that they were far from easy in execution, varied in range, and in result beneficial. Nevertheless Alfred's title seems somewhat cheaply earned when one contrasts his work with the mighty movements, the political and social revolutions engineered by history's other "great" men—Alexander of Macedon, Peter of Russia, Frederick of Prussia, Napoleon of France.

Why then is Alfred so honoured?

The answer is that it is quality rather than quantity that counts in these matters. Alfred has been called the "Great" not so much for what he did as for what he was. This is no original theory. It is the verdict of historians, and not, moreover, of historians only. If Alfred in his day was hero-worshipped as the saviour of Wessex, he was also revered as "England's Darling," and held up by the Saxon mother to her children as a model of right conduct. And this, surely, was nothing less than the application of a principle of faith in an age of faith, for while similarly the Saxon child learned to know Christ through stories of His miracles it learnt to love Him for what He was—a lesson learnt from His Little-ness and His "Failure," the lesson of the Crucifix, love's epitome.

What is true of Alfred is equally true of others. Hence this thought leads one to speak of a too-much neglected quality of that greatest, most famous and eventually most powerful Order of reformed Benedictines which was established in England during the early part of the twelfth century—the Cistercians. Among the tributes paid to that Order by its non-Catholic eulogists the chief is one which, however worthy and true, is hardly exalting. It is a tribute which in

our material age makes greatness commensurate only with material advancement, whether in the spheres of art, of science, of politics, or of sport.<sup>1</sup> Now that to which the majority of historians testify, what Mrs. Green in particular so admirably records in her "Henry II.", the Encyclopædia Britannica condenses as follows under the article "Cistercians:":—

It was as agriculturists and horse and cattle breeders that the Cistercians exercised their chief influence on the progress of civilization in the middle ages: they were the great farmers of those days, and many of the improvements in the various farming operations were introduced and propagated by them; it is from *this* point of view that the importance of their extension in northern Europe is to be estimated. [*Italics my own.*]

Here then we have a plain verdict. These monks were pioneers in industry. This was their chief work, and there is nothing more to be said! But how much is omitted in this "point of view," how narrow is it even materially considered! Why not at the least mention what in a Religious Order is a worthier quality and recognize in the Cistercians of the middle ages social reformers? And why neglect their worthiest work of all—their influence on religion? Why neglect the fact that "between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries many of their abbeys, as Clairvaux, Villiers, Himmerod, Heisterbach, etc., were nurseries of saints;" that more than forty of their members during this period have since been canonized. However, speaking for England only, the roll is not so glorious. The religious influence of their early days of zeal, enthusiasm and simplicity of life died out to give way rather to ecclesiastical influence.

The Cistercians, to repeat, were social reformers. No modern sense of propaganda work must be understood by this. Neither does one refer to their work as landlords or to that social influence exercised on the population by their system of Corrodies. They were social reformers in the sublimer sense that by admitting lay-brethren to their ranks they levelled the distinctions that existed between class and class. That the monks and the lay-brethren were recruited from two distinct classes of society is a point, I imagine, that need not be disputed, and that point is sufficient in view of

<sup>1</sup> Lamented for his loss to the stage—pitied presumably for his mistaken ideal—we have in the world's attitude towards the late Father Vaughan an example in point.

what one is about to add. What classes is another question.

Assuming one source to have been the large class of men in thirteenth century England who, without being serfs were quite uneducated, one is inclined by what evidence there is to believe that the "conversi" or lay-brethren were drawn from even a lower stratum of society; that some of them were men stained with crime, who, after claiming "right of sanctuary," had proved their penitence. Certainly the opportunities for such sanctuary were plenty. The Cistercians claimed a complete right of permanent sanctuary, and sternly upheld their privileges, backed as they were by papal authority, when occasion arose. Beaulieu Abbey in Hampshire was a sanctuary of national repute. And felons who claimed asylum seem to have availed themselves of their religious opportunities to some extent. In the *Registrum Johannis Pecham* (Rolls Series, iii, 995) we have an illustration, quoted by Dr. Cox in his *Sanctuaries and Sanctuary Seekers*. Archbishop Pecham, in a letter to Robert Malet, of November, 1289, says:

To the crown belongs not only severity and rigor of justice, but still more mercy and pity. By which Holy Church, by the king's will, saves evil-doers by sanctuary, by orders, and by the religious habit, as appears in the north country, where murderers, after their crime, betake themselves as converts to the great abbeys of the Cistercians and are safe.

Doctor Cox then gives an example in illustration of this power wielded by the Church. At Eastertide, 1240, a young shoemaker claimed right of sanctuary at the Cistercian monastery of Waverley, and, after proving himself of a devout turn of mind, was admitted as a lay-brother. A few months later he was seized and carried away by a certain Knight and his retinue for a previous homicide. Man of persistence and determination the abbot laid the scene of the outrage under interdict, which he refused to remove until the lay-brother had been restored to the abbey.

On the other hand the "monachi" or monks, whatever else they were, certainly were not of mean birth. From what class of society they came is a problem which has generally baffled historians. Speaking of the thirteenth century, however—what he considers "The Golden Age of English Monachism"—the eminently trustworthy and illuminative Dr. Jessop gives it as his opinion that the monks as a rule



were drawn from the gentry class, as distinguished from the aristocracy on the one hand, or the artisans on the other. In fact "*mutatis mutandis*," the representatives of the monks of the thirteenth century were the Fellows of Colleges of the nineteenth before the recent alteration of University and College Statutes came into force. An ignorant monk was certainly a rarity, an absolutely unlettered or uneducated one was an impossibility, and an abbot or prior who could not talk and write Latin with facility, who could not preach with tolerable fluency on occasion, and hold his own as a debater and man of business, would have found himself sooner or later in a very ridiculous and very uncomfortable position from which he might be glad to escape by resignation.

And one ventures to assert, albeit tentatively, that what is true of the thirteenth is all the more true of the previous century, for though the Cistercian Order had not yet risen to that accumulation of wealth and power which resulted in many of its abbots and priors sitting in Parliament, nevertheless they were vastly popular, and the sanctity and heroic labour of their lives induced many from the nobler classes to join them. The very founders—for the name of St. Bernard must be virtually linked with that of Stephen Harding—were nobles. Bernard belonged to a family of the highest nobility of Burgundy, and with four of his brothers and thirty other young noblemen of his province joined Cîteaux in 1112. Stephen Harding we know to have had the rare advantages of an education in the monasteries of Malmesbury and Sherborne, and of a pilgrimage to Rome before joining the Cluniacs at Molesme, previous to the secession thence and the founding of Cîteaux in 1098. In England, as elsewhere, many men of high calling, including abbots and priors of other religious orders, joined the Cistercians in their first days.

Serls and Hugh, Canon and Dean respectively of York Minster, resigned their high positions to cast in their lot with the colony of thirteen monks, headed by Richard the prior, who seceded from the great Benedictine Abbey of St. Mary's, York, and established the beginnings of Fountains near Ripon. Both were men of noble birth, who, by their substance, helped to alleviate the bitter burden of destitution that descended upon those thirteen heroic reformers who had fled their abbey with nothing save the habits they wore.

And now having shown how men of different ranks of life,

from the highest to the lowest, became members of the Cistercian Order, that aspect of their influence on which I wish to dwell becomes more manifest. For, however great the disparity of rank and status characterized its members before they joined, all those distinctions were broken down within the Order. There were no "caste" privileges. What distinctions still existed were, as we shall see, maintained for convenience' sake only. For monk as for brother, the life was the same, one of prayer and strenuous labour. Both recited the "Hours," the "monachi" in choir, the "conversi" privately in the nave or standing at work if they were in the fields. Both wore the same habit of cheap, grey frieze; both slept in it on the same hard, straw mattresses, bi-annually renewed. Even the abbot, in the early days of simplicity, slept with his monks in the dorter, and either rang the bell himself for duties or stood by the one who did. The lay-brethren had their own dorter (as they had, too, their own Chapter), but this was because, out of consideration for their hard work, they were exempted from Vigils or Matins, and so were not required to rise as early as the monks. The same food was eaten, with the slight difference again and for the same reason, that the "conversi" had a privilege the "monachi" were denied—each a "mixtum" (quasi-breakfast) of half-a-pound of the best bread, but as much of the coarser bread as he pleased. Monk and lay-brother, again, performed the same menial offices. In some monasteries the office of cook was a weekly one, held by all in turn. "Your brother," it was said to Louis, King of France, "washes the spoons and dishes in the kitchen of Clairvaux." And if the burden of the more strenuous labour fell upon the lay-brethren we must not imagine that the monks were idle. "Laborare est orare," Saint Benedict had said. The Cistercians believed it, and since at no time were they particularly devoted to learning as were the first sons of St. Benedict, monk shared with brother in the work of the fields, behind the plough, grinding corn, shearing sheep, melting ore at the forge. At a busy time like harvest all lent a hand, the whole community worked at high pressure, and the "meridian" after dinner was generally taken in the hay-fields instead of the dorter.

Finally, the same treatment was meted to both in sickness and to both at death.

It is superfluous now to point out the influence this regime must have had on a world still dominated by the artificial and tyrannical distinctions of the feudal system. At a time when the monasteries were more directly in touch with the world outside than they are now, and at a time, further, when there was scarcely a family of distinction that had not given one or more of its members to the Cistercian Order, the emergence of human dignity, of the worth of man as man, must have been very marked and must have helped greatly the full realization of the Christian ideal which serfdom and feudalism so marred.

One may, therefore, conclude that to look upon the Cistercians as mainly conquerors of the untamed forces of nature is to view them inadequately. That they were, but their chief exploit consisted in their subduing human pride. By their very lives being what they were they advanced civilization in higher ways than the merely material. Their history bids us recognize them first as religious, setting soul above body and the next life above this; and then as careful and progressive agriculturists, finding all things added to them because of their search for God's Kingdom and His Justice.

N. DOYLE

## EINSTEIN AND GRAVITATION

### THE ASTRONOMICAL TESTS<sup>1</sup>

**T**HE heliocentric theory of Copernicus (A.D. 1473—1543), a system adumbrated by the Greek philosophers, Pythagoras (572—497 B.C.) and Aristarchus (310—230 B.C), although placing the sun in the centre of the planetary system, nevertheless maintained the circularity of the movements of the planets around the central orb with a uniform velocity. But observation of the planets shows that they do not move round the sun with any such uniform velocity, and Copernicus was a keen and assiduous observer of the planets. Consequently he was forced to adopt the devices of Ptolemy, in order to square the heliocentric system with reality. That great and acute observer Tycho Brahe invented a modified heliocentric theory, by making the planets move round the sun, while the sun in its turn moved round the earth. The Copernican system was rejected by Bacon, while Descartes would not admit that it had been proved. In fact, no absolutely convincing proof of the heliocentric theory was adduced until Bradley discovered the aberration of light in 1726. It is true, nevertheless, that the discovery of the moons of Jupiter by Galileo, 1609, and their movements round their primary, was a striking analogy of the central sun and the encircling planets, and that the "phases" of the interior planets also pointed in the same direction. The position may be fairly stated in the words of the late Professor A. de Morgan:<sup>2</sup>

By investing Copernicus with a system which requires Galileo, Kepler, and Newton to explain it and their pupils to understand it, the modern astronomer refers the want of immediate acceptance of the system to ignorance, prejudice, and over-adherence to antiquity. No doubt all these things can be traced; but the ignorance was of a kind which belonged equally to the partisans and to the opponents, and which fairly imposed on the propounder of the system the onus of meeting arguments, which, in the period we speak of, he did not and could not meet.

By the propounder of the system, De Morgan means, of course, Galileo.

<sup>1</sup> From the presidential address to the Manchester Astronomical Society, Nov. 7, 1923.

<sup>2</sup> Companion to the British Almanack, 1855, p. 21.

The association of Tycho Brahe and Kepler in astronomical research was of immense importance for the advance of the mechanical theory of the planetary movements. Tycho Brahe was an incomparable observer, while Kepler utilized the observations to support theory. The difficulty with regard to the uniformity in circular motion in the Copernican heliocentric hypothesis was removed, when Kepler enunciated his empirical laws, that all the planets move round the sun in elliptic orbits with the sun at one focus, and that the "radius vector," or line joining the planet to the sun, sweeps out equal areas in equal intervals of time. These laws were followed by the third, connecting the times of revolutions of the planets with their mean distances from the sun, viz., that for all planets the square of the time of one complete revolution is proportional to the cube of its mean distance from the sun. It was the genius of Sir Isaac Newton who realized that this third law of Kepler would at once follow, if there existed a force of attraction towards the sun, the magnitude of which should be inversely proportional to the square of the distance. Also, that the curve described by the planets, on this supposition, would be an ellipse. This attraction was, moreover, due to the weight of a body, and it was the weight of the Moon, reduced in the inverse square of its distance, which kept it in its path round the Earth. And finally the universal law of gravitation states that any two bodies will attract each other with a force which is measured by the number giving the product of their masses, divided by the number representing the inverse square of their distances apart. This law is equally valid for a stone falling in a straight line to the earth, or for a planet, moving in an elliptical path, falling towards the sun. The labours of such mathematicians as D'Alembert, Clairaut, Lagrange, Laplace, Leverrier, Newcomb, have shown the exactitude with which this law explains all the movements of the planets, even though their revolutions round the sun are perturbed by their mutual attractions. By its aid the complete circumstances of phenomena, such for instance as those of total solar eclipses, can be predicted in advance. Founding their calculations upon this law, and taking note of the perturbations of Uranus in its orbit, Leverrier and Adams were independently able to point out the position of Neptune, the furthest planet of our system from the sun.

Gravitational astronomy had arrived at this position when

Einstein broached his theory of relativity, which has already been discussed from the theoretical standpoint at some length in these pages.<sup>1</sup> Still it may be worth while to submit to a further discussion the claims made for the theory as satisfying the practical astronomical tests. According to Einstein, he has explained an anomalous motion in the perihelion of Mercury, the deflection of light in the gravitational field of a heavy body, and a shift towards the red in the absorption lines of the solar spectrum. We shall discuss these *serialim*.

The planet Mercury is that member of the family which is nearest to the sun, and like all the other planets, it revolves round the sun in an ellipse. One result of the perturbations of the other planets upon Mercury is that its "perihelion," or point in its orbit where it is nearest the sun, should change its position in space. Leverrier, in 1859, found that this point of its orbit had a movement of about 38 seconds of arc in a century. This is greater than can be accounted for by the actions of the known planets. Accordingly it was suggested that there was a planet, or a ring of planets, with a total mass of about half that of Mercury itself, revolving round the sun inside Mercury, and situated almost in its plane. This planet, or planets, have been diligently sought for during times of total solar eclipse, but without any success. They are non-existent. Newcomb's investigations are in accord with those of Leverrier, the excess of the unexplained perihelial motion being about 43 seconds a century, that is, the apparent length of a 1-foot rule at the distance of one mile!

But let us quote Einstein. He writes:<sup>2</sup>

If Newton's theory be strictly correct, we ought to obtain for the orbit of a planet an ellipse, which is fixed with reference to the fixed stars. This deduction, which can be tested with great accuracy, has been confirmed for all the planets save one, with the precision that is capable of being obtained by the delicacy of observation attainable at the present time. The sole exception is Mercury, the planet which is nearest the sun. Since the time of Leverrier, it has been known that the ellipse corresponding to the orbit of Mercury . . . is not stationary with respect to the fixed stars, but that it rotates exceedingly

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, *Einstein versus Newton*, by C. O'Hara, S.J., Dec. 1919; *Aspects of the Theory of Relativity*, by the same, Jan. 1921, *More about Relativity*, by the same, Dec. 1923.

<sup>2</sup> *Relativity*, by A. Einstein, translated by Robert W. Lawson, D.Sc., Methuen and Co., London, 1920.



slowly in the plane of the orbit and in the sense of the orbital motion. The value obtained for this rotary movement of the orbital ellipse was 43 seconds of arc per century, an amount ensured to be correct to within a few seconds of arc. This effect can be explained by means of classical mechanics only on the assumption of hypotheses which have little probability, and which were devised solely for this purpose. On the basis of the general theory of relativity, it is found that the ellipse of every planet round the sun must necessarily rotate in the manner indicated above: and that for all the planets, with the exception of Mercury, this rotation is too small to be detected with the delicacy of observation possible at the present time; but that in the case of Mercury it must amount to 43 seconds of arc per century, a result which is strictly in agreement with observation.

Now let us hear the critics, their spokesman being, in the present instance, Mons. E. Esclangon, Director of the Observatory of Strasbourg, and President of the Commission on Relativity of the French National Committee of Astronomy in 1922.

If it is true [he argues] that the general theory of relativity furnishes exactly the number 43 seconds of arc, it is less certain that this is the exact quantity which the Newtonian system fails to account for. For the astronomical constants are known with a limited degree of precision, they are to be considered as a whole, and consequently any particular discordance depends upon the form which is given to them. One cannot therefore give to the number 43 in Newcomb's system, an absolute and certain value, "one can only assign to it sufficiently large limits, bringing it down perhaps to 30 seconds of arc by the adoption of another form of equilibrium of the whole of the astronomical constants."<sup>1</sup>

Recently for instance, in 1922, Grossmann has recalculated the discrepancy as 38 seconds of arc. A second objection arises from the fact that the Newtonian system applied to all the planets allows a departure of 43 seconds of arc to subsist in the movement of the perihelion of Mercury. On the other hand the general theory of relativity, abstracting from all the other planets, and considering Mercury alone in presence of the Sun, indicates that the perihelion of this planet, instead of remaining immovable, is displaced by precisely 43 seconds of arc in a century. The defect in this method would appear to be that in one case the Newtonian system is applied, and in the other the general theory of relativity, whereas it would be desirable that the calcu-

<sup>1</sup> *Rapports et Notes des Commissions*, p. 10.

lation of the planetary perturbations should be made entirely according to the theory of relativity. In other words, Einstein applies the theory of relativity for one particular case, and employs Newtonian mechanics to extend it. The result may be correct, but proof is needed to show that the process is logical. And it may be well, before discussing the second alleged physical proof of the general theory of relativity, which includes accelerations as well as velocities, to state the views of Einstein with regard to gravitation.

According to Newton a mass of matter attracts another mass with a force, which is measured by the quotient of the product of the two masses divided by the square of the distance between them. This is his universal law of gravitation, which, as we have seen, explained and codified the empirical laws of planetary motion about the sun, which had been derived by Kepler from the observations of Tycho Brahe. Force according to Newton, though it was not possible to define this quantity in itself, was measured by the rate of change of velocity, or the acceleration in a moving mass. These masses moved in a three-dimensional "continuum," referred to absolute axes in space, and the element of time entered as rating the change of velocity. By a three-dimensional "continuum" is meant, that, at any particular time, three measures were required to fix the position of the moving body in space. But gravitational force was a reality in itself independently of the observer, and the fundamental property of all masses was inertia, or that quality on account of which force is required to put them into motion. Now, according to Einstein's theory of relativity, gravitational force, in the Newtonian sense, does not exist. And why? Because it is impossible to distinguish between the effects of gravitational force and the effects of acceleration of any kind whatever. His principle of equivalence states, that a gravitational field of force at any point of space is in every way equivalent to an artificial field of force resulting from acceleration, so that no experiment is able to distinguish between them. The apparent force arises solely from a rate of change of velocity, or change of direction of velocity in a moving body, in a word, from acceleration. This at first sight looks very much like Newton's definition of force. The difference is that, whereas according to Newton gravitational fields of force really existed, according to Einstein they are mere illusions, dependent on the relative

acceleration of an observer. Hence, for the purposes of mathematical calculation, gravitation according to this theory is reduced to the effect of curvature in a four-dimensional "continuum."<sup>1</sup> By a four-dimensional "continuum" the mathematician does not mean to assert that there is an actual fourth dimension in space. What he does mean is, that in a space mathematically conceived, four measurements are necessary to define completely the interval between two events. And he adds that a certain combination of these four measurements, as expressed in a mathematical formula, is constant for all observers, whatever their individual measurements of time and distance may be. The path of any particle in space and in time will be represented by a line in this four-dimensional "continuum," which is called, in the language of the relativists, a geodesic or world-line. And the theory of relativity demands that the same world-line should represent the history of a moving particle in the universe equally well for all observers. The observers move relatively to one another, but their different subjective view of the world-line is due to their choice of a different frame of reference in space. According to Einstein, in his restricted theory of relativity, the phenomena of Nature, where Nature means simply an aggregate of events, will be the same for any two observers, who move relatively to one another with any uniform velocity whatever. This is the result of the failure of the Michelson and Morley experiment to detect the motion of the earth through the ether, which had hitherto been supposed to be an absolute standard of complete rest.<sup>2</sup> Not that the ether of space does not exist, for how, otherwise, independently of its existence, could we explain the propagation of light? Add to this restricted theory the principle of equivalence between acceleration and gravitation, as stated above, and we get the generalized theory.

Consequently in this generalized theory space and time are merely subjective, just as much as up and down, right

<sup>1</sup> In an able letter, which, under the signature "W.G.", appeared in *Nature* of February 12, 1920, the writer drew an extraordinary parallel between the non-Euclidean geometry of the Einstein theory, and the conditions obtaining in the space behind a convex mirror. The author concluded very quaintly with a reference to "Alice through the Looking-Glass": "According to the theory of relativity, if the observer is moving with the velocity of light, time remains unchanged. This must have been the case with the Mad Hatter. With him it was always six o'clock, and always tea-time."

<sup>2</sup> Recent astronomical observations show the existence in space of dark clouds apparently absolutely at rest.

and left, back and front. The only thing that is objective is the four-dimensional "continuum," inasmuch as it contains the objective record of the motion of all particles in the universe. This theory is not a mere figment of the mind, a mere juggling with mathematical equations, but it is the result of experiment and observation, and hence claims to be a physical theory of the universe. Einstein, as we have said, explains gravitation by a curvature inherent in the "continuum," and the path of a particle is its world-line which is determined by natural laws. The world-line of a ray of light in the "continuum" is called a geodesic. Consequently, if it passes near a heavy body the curvature of the "continuum" will be impressed upon it. For instance, a ray of light coming to the eye of an observer from a distant star and passing near the sun will be bent. As we judge of the apparent positions of objects by the direction of the light which enters the eye, the effect will be an apparent displacement of the image of the star from its position, as measured, for example, on a photographic plate, when the sun was not present. The displacement is very minute, but given good photographs is easily measurable. At the edge of the sun the angle between a straight line from star to observer and the bent ray will give a displacement of 1.75 seconds of arc, about the diameter of a half-penny two miles away, the angle becoming less in direct proportion to its inverse distance from the sun.

Sir Isaac Newton imagined that a ray of light was composed of material corpuscles. Substitute the word electrons for corpuscles, and his supposition is entirely consonant with modern concepts in the domain of physics, light being an electro-magnetic phenomenon. Henry Cavendish in the eighteenth century showed, that a beam of light composed of corpuscles would be deviated from the straight path in passing through the gravitational field of the sun by an angle of 0.88 seconds of arc, just one-half the deviation postulated by the generalized theory of relativity. This deviation, too, would be in accord with the restricted theory of Einstein.

The first total solar eclipse at which any attempt was made to test the experimental verification of the Einstein theory was that of 1918. The plates secured by the expedition from the Lick Observatory were measured by Dr. Curtis. Professor W. W. Campbell, the Director of the Observatory,

gave an account of the result of these measurements at a special meeting of the Royal Astronomical Society held July 11, 1919.<sup>1</sup> All precautions were taken that the reference plates, when the sun was not present in the field, should be free of all possible errors. There were fifty stars on the plates taken during the eclipse.

The corrected differences of position were measured along radii from the Sun to each star and were arranged in order of distance from Sun to star. Dr. Curtis was not able to say that there was anything systematic about these differences, which showed no change of the order required by Einstein's second hypothesis. The probable error of one star position was of the order of 0.5 seconds of arc, regrettably large when we are dealing with the differences of small quantities—the difference between the expected displacements of the nearest and furthest stars being only 0.26 seconds of arc. A telescope of great focal length would have been of great help in this work. For the one we used the stars were too faint, and in the long exposure required we suffered from the increased extent of coronal structure.

Curtis divided the fifty stars on the plates into two groups, an inner and an outer group. The differential displacement between the two groups should have been 0.08 or 0.15 seconds of arc, according to the restricted or the generalized theories of relativity respectively. The mean of the measures came out as 0.05 and of the right sign, that is the displacement varied inversely as the distance from the sun. This result would be more in accord with Einstein's restricted theory of relativity. For the reasons stated by Professor Campbell, astronomers generally looked upon these results as inconclusive. But the American astronomers did not seem to be convinced, for at the meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held at Seattle in 1920, and again in California in 1921, which meeting was subsequent to the British expedition of 1919, when the question was discussed, they maintained that their plates indicated no shift of the stars in accordance with Einstein's theory. At the latter meeting the Lick astronomers brought up the evidence of three sets of plates from former eclipses which they had measured. The mean of all these results was a shift of 0.88 seconds of arc, in accordance with Einstein's restricted theory of relativity, and also with the shift demanded by the Newtonian mechanics.

<sup>1</sup> *The Observatory*, XLII., No. 542, August, 1919, pp. 298, 299.

But meanwhile expeditions from Greenwich and from Cambridge had been despatched, armed with telescopes of long focal length, to observe the total solar eclipse of May 29, 1919. The results from these observations showed that the displacement varied inversely as the distance from the sun. Also the value of the displacement from the plates of the Cambridge expedition, which was hampered by cloudy weather, was 1.61 with a probable error of 0.30, and from the Greenwich plates 1.98 with a probable error of only 0.12. Professor H. N. Russell showed that the photographs exhibited a difference in horizontal and vertical scale of 1 part in 12,000. This was due to the distortion of the mirrors which supplied the telescopes with light, under the heating influence of the sun's rays. If the results are corrected accordingly, the accord with the value predicted by Einstein is very much closer.

The problem was again attacked in the Australian eclipse of September, 1922, by the Lick observers, and this time with telescopes of long focal length without the intermediary of *cœlostats* mirrors. The plates were measured by Professor Campbell and by Dr. Trumpler, the number of stars on the plates being 62 to 85. The mean value for the displacement as obtained by Professor Campbell is 1.60 with a probable error of 0.14, and by Dr. Trumpler 1.78 with a probable error of 0.11. The mean result from the four plates measured comes out finally as 1.72 seconds of arc, with a probable error of 0.11. This agrees almost exactly with Einstein's predicted value 1.75. From being a sceptic, Professor Campbell has become a convinced believer in the concordance of the predicted and the observed value of the displacement. So much so, that he considers it unnecessary, in view of the 1919 and the 1922 results, that the observations should be repeated at future eclipses. It is worthy of note that each increase in the perfection of the instrumental equipment has brought the observed result nearer to that predicted by theory.

But now comes an objection to the view, that these results of the British and American astronomers are to be regarded as a definite establishment of Einstein's gravitational theory, from a critic of the first rank in mathematical physics, Professor Sir Joseph Larmor, who occupies at Cambridge the chair of mathematics which was held by Sir Isaac Newton himself. He does not dispute the accuracy of the measures on



the photographic plates. But the inference he draws is that the measurements being correct the Einstein theory cannot stand, at any rate without serious modification. He argues "that, if the subject is consistently reasoned out on Einstein's own point of view, one ought to arrive at a value equal to half the result asserted by him, notwithstanding that this result is confirmed substantially by observation."<sup>1</sup> Sir Joseph Larmor also tells us that French critics, led by Professor Le Roux of Rennes, were led to a more drastic view "that the Einstein ideas were incapable of leading to any definite result at all; and considerable recent discussion in Paris does not seem to have shaken their position." Monsieur Esclançon, for instance, tells us that, if one confines oneself to the photographs, the formula of Einstein does not furnish a better account of them, and even less good, than several others which are very remote and very different from it. As Sir Joseph Larmor writes:

From a different point of view, Einstein has arrived at twice Cavendish's formula: but his argument, though fascinating, has been widely challenged as unsound on its own premises. Other points of view may in future lead to the same or to other multiples of the Newtonian value. The critics would doubtless be glad to be convinced; but so far as I am aware no adequate answer to their entirely independent questionings has yet been forthcoming.

According to Sir Joseph Larmor, it would seem that the mathematics are wrong somewhere, and we may leave the mathematicians to thresh the subject out. But, as a practical measure, it appears to be advisable to make observations upon this point of the deflection of light at every total solar eclipse.

It will be unnecessary to discuss the technicalities of spectroscopic observations involved in the experiments which have been made, notably by Dr. Evershed at Kodaikanal, and by Dr. St. John at Mount Wilson, to substantiate the accordance of theory and observation with regard to the third astronomical test, *i.e.*, the displacement towards the red of the spectral lines of any element in the sun as compared with their position if the element is observed on earth. They agree in verifying Einstein's prediction. But the subject is a difficult one, as so many factors are involved in the

<sup>1</sup> Letter in *The Times*, dated April 14, 1923.

position of the absorption lines in the solar spectrum. And they have not succeeded in convincing all the experts, whose objections were stated by Professor Newall at the December, 1923, meeting of the Royal Astronomical Society.

We have endeavoured in the above discussion to state as impartially as possible the present state of knowledge with regard to the three fundamental astronomical tests of the validity of the generalized theory of relativity. And the conclusion is, that although the evidence is greatly in favour of Einstein's views, we cannot consider the tests to be as rigidly satisfied, or so fully explained, as to exclude all possibility of doubt. Even the fundamental experiment of Michelson and Morley, upon the negative results of which the whole edifice of relativity has been built up, is called in question by eminent physicists and mathematicians. For example, Professor C. Somigliana, in an article on the Foundations of Relativity,<sup>1</sup> writes:

We can say that the question of the propagation of light when the source is in motion is not yet settled, neither by experiment, nor by theory. We can study it and we can search deeper into it in numerous directions and in several ways. But the least reasonable of all seems to us to be to overthrow the foundations of mechanics and physics in order to explain a fact, which is still uncertain, which even is very probably not true, and which in any case has not been interpreted in a definite manner.

Nevertheless, this does not in the least invalidate Einstein's great generalization of the invariance of the laws of nature under all transformations of co-ordinates. This, in the opinion of those most competent to judge, is the work of a mathematical genius of the highest order. The system must not be supposed to be opposed to Newtonian mechanics. It is a more generalized theory of which Newtonian mechanics is a particular case.

A. L. CORTIE.

<sup>1</sup> I fondamenti della relatività. *Scientia*, XXIV., n. 135, 7. July, 1923.

## PROFESSOR SPEARMAN AND SCHOLASTICISM'

WHEN Binet introduced his simplified procedure in Experimental Psychology, he initiated a revolution which is still rising in strength, and on which it is time that the best reflective and critical thought should be concentrated. Dissatisfied with the small practical progress made by the psycho-physicists, who were devoured by the mania of subjecting all experiments to number and measure, and whose proud boast was that most of their psychology was of no practical use, Binet discarded the elaborate instruments used in psychological laboratories, and endeavoured to discover a method of appreciating human intelligence by propounding questions to be answered or actions to be performed, and by relying on introspection where possible to form an opinion of the mental processes involved. Where introspection was impossible, he formed his opinions from the success or failure of the subject to give correct answers or to perform the correct actions.

His success was immediate, and his Tests of Intelligence have been made the basis of all further experimental progress in this field. However, it is beginning to be suspected that it is by no means clear what precisely *is* being tested, and that it is time that theory stepped in once more to lay down the fundamental principles that govern the use of "Intelligence."

Professor Spearman, in his book, has this task for object. There is need of such a book, and there is also need of an expert of his calibre to write it, one moreover, who is not afraid to think clearly. That there is need of answering the question is shown by the number of times I have heard those who occupy positions of responsibility in education asking it, and inquiring moreover what *are* the functions which proposed tests really make manifest, and whether these functions are all or a part of, or belong at all to, the thing which ordinary cultivated people call "Intelligence."

The most striking fact in the present feverish excitement over tests is the manner in which the experimenters burke the

<sup>1</sup> *Nature of "Intelligence," and the Principles of Cognition*, C. Spearman. Macmillan Co.

question at issue, or manifest how varied and nebulous are their opinions of the function they are testing. This is well brought out in our author's opening chapter. It is further exemplified in the following quotation from the December number of the *Journal of Education and School World*, which shows the same indefiniteness and hesitancy of which Prof. Spearman complains:—

If we define intelligence as the extent to which a person has profited by experience, it is quite possible for us to devise a test which should show whether a pupil has responded profitably to environmental stimuli.

Maybe it is, but the question still remains, Is the hypothetical definition true? And there is the further query, What does the very ambiguous phrase "profit by experience" signify? The extent to which persons "profit by experience" differs in quality, and we must first know how these qualitative differences are connected with the possession of "Intelligence," before we can frame tests which shall bring them into play, if they are there.

The result of thus either avoiding the preliminary question, or of throwing out any vague idea, which contains a sufficient germ of truth to make it passable, is that experimenters in their tests must inevitably be guided by preconceptions which they fail to justify, and by purposes which need not by any means have the *education* of the child as their main object. They will be makeshifts imposed either by the social requirements of the day, or by the pet fancies of the experimenter, or will be simply a reaction against previous unsatisfactory attempts.

Therefore we welcome this present attempt to analyse the functions which constitute Intelligence. Its method is sound, needless to say it shows knowledge of its subject-matter, and what perhaps in these days of loose writing is more worthy of remark, it is clear and logical. Naturally scholastics are drawn closer to it by the expressed admiration for the methods of the masters of their school, but it must not be supposed that Prof. Spearman thinks in their categories. His fundamental position is one that can be easily made to fit into scholastic doctrine, or rather, his principles may be taken up by scholastics with advantage in order to expand and give more life to their own treatment of the subject. But the "Intelligence" he is speaking about is not quite the

same as the faculty of "Intellect" as understood by scholastics. It has a wider connotation, and must be regarded rather as a complex function, including within itself operations which would be described formally by scholastics as mixed sensitive and intellectual operations (*e.g.*, those of memory and imagination). In spite of that, the three fundamental principles which, in his view, constitute Intelligence as a noegenetic, or mind-derived, activity are essentially those which scholasticism would accept.

In order to avoid disputes between schools, the author has had recourse to the dictionary, so as to find out the generally accepted sense of the word intelligence. This has led him to describe Intelligence by reference to the principles which make such a description possible. He finds that there are three main noegenetic principles, *i.e.*, principles whose activities terminate in products which are specifically "Intelligent." Besides these, he enumerates various quantitative principles, which are anoegenetic, which may, *i.e.*, alter the products in extension or intensity or in rapidity, but do not make any difference to the intrinsic quality of the product; they will, however, make a difference to the amount of general intelligence we attribute to a person. On these quantitative principles we need not dwell; for our purpose the first are by far the most interesting. These three principles then are stated thus:—(1) Any lived experience tends to evoke immediately a knowing of its character and experienter. (2) The mentally presenting of any two or more characters tends to evoke immediately a knowing of relation between them. (3) The presenting of any character with any relation tends to evoke immediately a knowing of the correlative character ("the educating of correlates").

These three principles are then shown to be at work in all intellectual processes, whether of perception, memory or imagination. This view of "Intelligence" is in wonderful harmony with that of the scholastics' "Intellect." The use of the word "immediately" in each principle shows that the author looks on the function as irreducible, not a derivative of a more fundamental connative function of which it is the mere instrument. It is, *i.e.*, relatively independent, and acts in its own right. It is intended to present "what is" and if it does not in any particular circumstance, that failure is due to the interference of some other anoegenetic activity. The work of Intelligence is to bind whatever is experienced into

a system of rational relations, *i.e.*, of objective relations, in which the connection of one object with another is perceived within the attributes of the objects themselves—not, as some of the minor lights of the New Psychology assert, imposed on a plastic primary material by the connative impulses of the individual.

I take the first principle to mean that Intelligence gives a "meaning" to sensed experience, and at the same time presents it as an "object" in opposition to the experienter. This is mentioned here because the author in his tentative explanation of transcendence falls back on the third principle although transcendence seems clearly to flow from this principle as a necessary corollary.

It may be said that this first principle roughly corresponds to the function of forming concepts, as understood by scholastics. If by "concepts" is understood "universals" precisely as universal, then it does not; but though concept and universal are often used as interchangeable terms, psychologically the concept, by which an "intelligibility" is presented is anterior to the universal. The latter is a work of conscious reflexion on the former. Moreover, in the application of concepts to experience, the concept must naturally shed its character of universality the moment it is so applied, else it would be false. And human perception is probably never merely on the sensitive plane, but nearly always a fusion of intellectual and sensitive process. Hence this principle may be regarded as more fundamental than that of forming "universals."

The second principle corresponds in the same way to the function of forming concepts of relation. This and the third are the processes by which the mind builds up its experiences into an ordered, organized system. And since, according to Prof. Spearman, the relations spring from the characters as from their basis, it follows that they must belong to the same objective order as the characters themselves. In almost direct opposition to Kant, his statement is that nature imposes its laws on the intellect and not *vice versa*.

There are thus many points of contact between the author's theory and that of scholastic doctrine of the main functions of intellect. Whether he would agree with what the schoolmen teach as to the range within which the intellect can be applied to reality in general, is a point that cannot be determined from his book. Such agreement will depend on what



is the nature of the characters and of the relations which are made known by intellectual activity. That, however, though not a minor point, is one that may be allowed to await development. It is no small thing to have a distinguished psychologist clearly taking it for granted that Intelligence is not merely the complication of sense "images," or of their "association," but is an activity transcending sense-activity altogether.

He does not entirely take this for granted either. In a very striking chapter, he discusses the value of imagery in intellectual thinking. And his conclusions will no doubt startle even orthodox scholastics. His results lead him to state that neither the capacity to form images nor the actual use of them bears any proportion to the amount of intelligence or to its quality. It is only by giving the word imagery a meaning that whittles it down to nothing that we can make images enter as a necessary ingredient into all thinking. Whether this conclusion will be confirmed in all respects, time alone can show; the results of experimental work depends so very much on the point of attention of the subject, and also a good deal on the unconscious attitude of the experimenter. But one thing is certain, that images are not the constituents of intellectual thinking, and that certainty, never doubted by scholasticism, is now being confirmed by a convergence of testimony from many different laboratories. The days of "Associationism" are over.

To those who wish to make closer acquaintance with this work, we can only recommend them to get it for themselves and read it right through. It is eminently worth careful study, and much will be learnt. Our object in the rest of this paper is to raise one or two points where the author's view seems to us difficult of comprehension, regarding matters, some of which are side issues, but which have their interest in actual practice, and of which one at least is pertinent to the main subject. We will treat the latter first.

The author is occupied with "Intelligence" as it is generally understood by the ordinary cultivated person, not as it is defined *à priori* by any particular school. It is that thing which many research workers are trying to find means of testing. His conclusion is that the principles which most of all deserve the name of "Intelligence" are—from the view of modifying behaviour, which, after all, is the only way we have of externally testing another person—the two non-experiential principles, Nos. 2 and 3 of his list. Now, his

standpoint is thoroughly "intellectualistic" throughout. That is, he views Intelligence as the capacity of *exhibiting or presenting* relations; connation is an outside activity. In the same way, he seems to reject the view that Intelligence is a synthetic process, or rather, that there is a synthetic process which constitutes and differentiates intelligence as such.

Both these positions seem difficult. There is a growing body of evidence to show—and we should almost expect it *a priori*—that connation and "intellect" are indissolubly united in actual process, and that the alteration in the quality of one element will produce a difference of quality in the "intelligent" resultant. It is not merely that connative elements inhibit or excite intelligent action. Connative elements are not *merely* blind impulses, all pushing from behind, but they possess their own intrinsic ends, quite specific as ends, though not as means to ends, and, as soon as they are aroused towards those ends, they inform consciousness itself, and endeavour to shape the cognitive elements therein to follow them. At first vaguely presented in consciousness as an "I know not what," they still make the mind purposively selective in picking out the characters of an experience, neglecting some and choosing others. They do not make cognition thereby "subjective," but they decidedly make the act of knowing highly selective. And therefore the nature of the characters made known and of the relations educed will be, or will tend to be, in accordance with the connative element present.<sup>1</sup> And characters (or attributes) and relations differ not only in extent but also "in depth" or in the degree of the reality they present. That is, they will differ in quality, and the use of "Intelligence" will thus be differentiated. In fact "Intelligence" appears to have as a constitutive a *moral* element which differentiates it no less than the cognitive and the research work of the New Psychologists promises to open out a new field of investigation in this department.

The objection of the author against the view of a synthetic process of intelligence is also hard to understand. It apparently arises from making synthesis to mean "a mere placing together." This certainly is not the usual meaning ascribed to the term. "A mere placing together" might describe association, but synthesis generally connotes more. It conveys the idea of an aggregation of elements in such a

<sup>1</sup> In this sense, as experience shows, the wish is often father to the thought.

way that the union expresses something more than the juxtaposition of the parts. And as a matter of fact, the eduction of correlates (to which, for some reason that I cannot understand, the author says the term cannot even pretend to apply) seems a clear case of synthetic process. Correlates are not educed from any character and relation as though these were in vacuo, so that given a character and a given relation, only one correlate is possible. This may be so in some cases, but in very many it is not. The correlate is more often determined by demands of context, intention and purpose which are present and active in the mind. It is a case of fitting in, not of analysis, and this is a synthetic process. And this is no less true of the nature of the characters which, by the first principle, intelligence tends to make known in experience.

In this regard, a word may not be out of place on the way in which St. Thomas understood Intellect. The author in his opening chapter says that the scholastics beautifully defined Intelligence as the faculty of forming universals. It must be confessed that it is to this function that they paid most attention, the reason being chiefly the polemics of the day. But it does not describe accurately St. Thomas's theory of Intellect. For him the primary fundamental function of Intellect was Intuition, and this is essentially synthetic, it is the power of grasping the reciprocal meaning of details in a unity. The function of forming universals is strictly a subordinate function, intended to act as a substitute for the intuitions of reality which are wanting to the human mind on account of its imperfections. It may be a matter of words, but I think there is a deep and real question underlying the verbal one, whether the fundamental activity of intelligence is analytic or synthetic. Those whose minds are preoccupied with the technique and the procedure of the positive sciences will tend to turn their whole attention on the analytic aspect of intellectual processes; and likewise those who consider intelligence emphatically as the function of forming universals. But both these are merely preliminary steps to a much more important one, namely, that of employing the results of these analyses as a means of grasping the totality of given reality in greater detail. In fact, this almost invincible tendency of intelligence to complete the immanent movement of its essential dialectic is shown strongly in those who have specialized on some aspect of nature—especially the physicists—who are almost invariably borne on to view the whole

universe in the terms of their specialized categories, and so to substitute the part for the whole.

The second point which ought to arouse almost passionate curiosity is the author's view of "Experience." I confess I do not quite understand it. Experience is apparently a primitive undergoing, a living of a process, which need have nothing to do with consciousness. "Knowing" is the spontaneous reaction of Intelligence to experience by which the latter is given meaning, and so placed in the objective order. It need not follow—there is, *i.e.*, no *à priori* connection between the two—and on this fact the author seems to base finally his acceptance of the possibility of the "Unconscious" such as it is put forward by one branch of the New Psychology.

Now, if we are going to use the term experience to denote any vital reaction of the organism to stimuli, we are certainly applying it in a legitimate way; and there will also certainly be some experiences which are unconscious. Most of the reactions which used to go by the name of vegetative are of this nature, at all events they are not conscious to ordinary human consciousness. Reflex actions, as such, are of the same kind, and it may be true that whenever an "action current," however feeble, is detectible in a nerve, there may be a reaction corresponding to a reflex action. All this, by the way, does not bring us within anything like speaking-distance to the "unconscious" that is postulated by the psycho-analysts.

But this description of experience being granted, it by no means follows that knowing is something distinct from experience. Indeed, knowing is simply one form of it. It is a vital reaction to a stimulus, and the act of knowing is itself the act of undergoing something. There is no reason to suppose that it is a sort of secondary reaction to a vital process which is yet more fundamental. The supposed reason lies in the calm presupposition of physicists that their definitions are constitutive of reality as it is; and psychologists are only just beginning to shake off the incubus. We have still to appreciate the full meaning of the real truth uttered by Mr. Balfour in his Gifford lectures, that the object of the physicists is an abstract construction, carved out of reality *to suit their interests*; but not in any way exhaustive. Their interests lie in the spatial and temporal attributes of "objects"; and a slight consideration of their utterances will at once show that nothing there tells us what the object *is*,

but simply what is the relation of one object to another. The basis of these relations is formed simply by the *concepts* of extensity and of motion, not by *things*. And by ignoring the further implications of these concepts, they disregard the necessary notion of "Quality" which is contained in these concepts and which ought to be developed if the full notion of object is to be explicitly set forth. That the author is weighted by physicists' dogmas is shown by his preliminary discussion of the nature of sensation. This does not affect his excellent discussion of intelligence when once it is evoked, but it does affect his view of the material on which it works.

Recent literature has shown that psychologists need to come to an understanding on the meaning they are to attach to the word "Conscious." Prof. Spearman seems to mean by it "the capacity to attach a meaning," in this respect agreeing with Kant. Others understand by it the capacity to refer an experience to the present Ego; yet others the power of apperceiving an experience. If any of these descriptions be accepted, there still remains a form of psychical activity which cannot be called unconscious in the sense used by psycho-analysts, or in the sense defined by Pierre Janet. It matters little what it is called, "Realization" or "Awareness" or what not, so long as it is recognized. Perhaps "presentation" used by James Ward is as good as any. In any case, it is a psychic act by which characters are made present to the mind which *can* know them, though, until it does exercise its spontaneous activity, they are not "known," but exercise their influence on instincts and on automatic tendencies.

All these types of "presentation" and reaction, from the lowest form to the highest, might be called psychic experience, and it has yet to be shown that their characteristics are not specifically distinct from physiological or any other form of experience.

The discussion of the author's view of the "unconscious" which we had proposed as another point must be left out, as the limits of space have already been reached. What has been said will be sufficient to show the warm welcome that should be accorded to this book. Its main principles are such as we can truthfully say are our own, the points of disagreement can be paralleled in writings from our own authors. And it introduces the application of its principles into departments of thought which we should look for in vain in any of our ordinary text-books.

V. MONCEL.

## CATHOLIC JACOBITES IN 1716

MEMOIRS OF FATHER THOMAS LAWSON, S.J.

EVERYONE nowadays knows the general characteristics of the old Jacobite party. Firm and loyal they were, though somewhat inelastic and somewhat narrow. Father Thomas Lawson, as we shall see, was a favourable representative of their class, being the seventh son of a race of sturdy Yorkshire squires, Lawson of Brough, whom Charles II. had made baronets out of regard for their good services to the Stuart cause. Educated from his boyhood by the English Jesuits at St. Omers, Thomas entered young into the Society, and passed all his life in posts of authority. Now he was rector, now master of novices, now provincial, now confessor at the Stuart court at Versailles, over which the highly conscientious Queen Mary of Modena then presided.

By 1716, however much ultra conservatives might ignore the fact, everybody knew that the Stuart cause was feeble, even decrepit. The rather inglorious collapse of the English rising of 1715, just when the cause was coming under the direction of a second generation of leaders, caused certain heart-burnings, plans for the future were warmly discussed and new suggestions were made. But unfortunately these suggestions were kept secret, as was inevitable in those days. In consequence, misunderstandings followed, in which Father Lawson himself, as he will tell us, became involved. His story, which now follows, may be described as his version of a long misunderstanding.

### AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF, AND SOME REMARKS UPON THE OATHS OF ALLEGIANCE AND SUBMISSION.<sup>1</sup>

*William III. not uncivil to Catholics, but they keep  
out of his party.*

The Prince of Orange, afterwards King William III., though he had usurped the throne of England by the

<sup>1</sup> The original contemporary MS. is at Stonyhurst and forms the first article in codex, MS. A. iv. 31, ff. 1—25. On the last leaf is written in the hand of Dr. George Oliver these words, "Belongs to Stonyhurst College." Father Lawson's literary style cannot be called good, the spelling is bad, the hand is much cramped. Some paragraph-headings, dates and changes of type have been introduced by the Editor.



treachery of the Protestants, let upon occasions expressions fall of esteem of the Catholics; and, though he knew their principles would not suffer them to come entirely into his party against their Lawful Sovereign, King James II., of happy memory, he resolved to oblige them to submit quietly and give no disturbance to his Government. To execute his design he resolved to oblige them to take an Oath of Fidelity to him, and because he knew they made difficulty to take the Oath of Allegiance, made in the reign of King James I., it was proposed in Parliament to draw up a short and plain oath importing only a promise of true Allegiance. When this Oath came out many believed it a lawful oath and took it. Many boggled at the word "*true Allegiance*" and refused it.

Their chief reason for refusing seemed to be this: "True Allegiance" implying in its natural and legal sense a promise to comply faithfully with all the duties a Subject owes to his Sovereign. They thought that by this Oath they would be obliged to fight against King James, should he attempt to recover his kingdom; and as it is without doubt a sin of injustice to hinder the King from recovering his right, so they thought themselves obliged in conscience to refuse taking the Oath. They that took it were convinced that no more was required of them than to be quiet, and to give no disturbance to the (f. 2) Government because care was always taken upon any suspicion of the King's coming in to render them incapable of fighting, either for it or against it, by seizing their horses and arms.

Besides, Mr. Walsh, a Member of Parliament, and who had been chairman in the Committee that drew up the formula of the Oath, declared to Sir Harry Lawson that nothing more was required of Catholics by the Oath than to sit quiet and to give no disturbance to the Government.

The main difficulty seems to lie here. *Though a subject in some cases may be excused from assisting the King, or fighting for him to recover his kingdom, yet he cannot in conscience bind himself by oath not to do it, it being an essential part of his Allegiance to assist him against his enemies.* The answer to this difficulty was that there is a vast difference between fighting against the King to hinder him from getting his right, and not fighting for him to gain it. Nothing can excuse the first from a sin of injustice, and therefore it is never lawful. But a subject may in many

cases without danger of sin stay at home though called upon to come and join the Army.

1. First, for example, when by reason of infirmity of body he is physically or morally rendered incapable of doing any service.

2. When the King is at some distance and guards are so placed (f. 4) to hinder people from going in, that there is little or no probability of being able to join.

3. *Should soldiers threaten to burn their house and to shoot them* through their head, if they would not bind themselves by oath not to join the King. But if in this case one may lawfully remain at home and oblige himself by oath not to stir, why may not one, upon as strong a reason, oblige himself beforehand not to assist the King against the Government? But these reasons shall be examined afterwards in a more proper place.<sup>1</sup>

*Changes in ruling Houses, and the Spanish war of succession.*

About the latter end of 1697 the Peace of Ryswick<sup>2</sup> put an end to the precedent War. King William was acknowledged by the King of France and Ambassadors sent mutually to one another, notwithstanding King James II. continued still at St. Germain.

Charles II., King of Spain, being in a languishing condition, there were great apprehensions of a general war upon his demise about the succession. To prevent a war, England and France entered into measures to prevent it by a Partition treaty and entered into an Alliance to maintain it. A time was fixed for the Emperor to come into this treaty, if he would not the King of France was to be at liberty to assert his pretensions.

In October, as I take it, 1700, Charles II. of Spain died and left his Kingdoms to Philip, Duke of Anjou, grandson to Louis XIV. and second son of the Dauphin. An Ambassador was sent, immediately after the King's decease, from the Cardinal Regent and both states of Spain into France, to demand the Duke, but Louis would not consent before he had consulted King William. The time fixed for coming into the Partition treaty being expired, he sent word back

<sup>1</sup> But they are not further explained.—ED.

<sup>2</sup> The peace of Ryswick was signed September 20th, 1697.

to King Louis that he was at liberty to do in this affair as he pleased. Upon this answer King Louis condescended to the Spaniard, acknowledged his grandson to be King and sent him to Spain; King William also acknowledged him.

*Death of James II. and subsequent legal changes.*

In September the following year, 1701, King James II. died (f. 5) at St. Germain, leaving Queen Mary of Modena Regent, and having recommended the Prince his son to the care and protection of King Louis. Accordingly he undertook the charge and declared in form the Prince King of England, etc., by the title of King James III. This exasperated William so much that he disowned the King of Spain, joined with the Emperor and declared war. The Parliament also resented this affront put upon the King that both Houses resolved upon making an *Oath of Abjuration of King James III.* So it was made and passed both Houses, signed by Commission, King William lying dangerously ill of a fall from his horse and not able to do it. This new Oath was joined to the Test and was not tendered to any, as much as I remember, besides them that by reason of Places in the Government were obliged to take that. King William dying soon after, Anne, Princess of Denmark, 2nd daughter of King James II., was declared Queen, 1702. Catholics were pretty quiet, and permitted to remain so until the year 1708, when upon an Invasion designed upon Scotland by King James III. it was resolved upon that the Oath of Abjuration should be tendered to the Catholics, but the intended Invasion coming to nothing, the design of tendering the Oath was also laid aside.

*The rising of 1715.*

In the year 1715 another attempt was designed and executed. The Earl of Derwentwater, Ld. Widdrington, Mr. Forrester and several others, both Catholics and Protestants, rose in *Northumberland* to second an insurrection begun in Scotland by the *Earl of Mar*, the King came over privately and joined him. Several Officers and Noblemen, both English, Scotch and Irish, were called over and followed him, but not meeting with success, he was advised to return into France. Ld. Derwentwater and his party marched first into Scotland, being there reinforced (f. 6) they came back into England and marched to Preston, where they were promised

by some Protestant Lords and Gentlemen a considerable reinforcement, but excepting Catholic few or none came in. This obliged them to surrender, and great numbers were executed as rebels.

George I. then sat upon the throne, was highly incensed against the Catholics, who were advised to do something to satisfy the Government, and to deserve its Protection. There were several meetings of Catholic Lords and Gentlemen on this subject and an oath was proposed called an "Oath of Submission" in which the word "Allegiance" was left out<sup>1</sup> by reason of the difficulties about the *legal meaning* of this word in the former Oath of Allegiance.<sup>2</sup>

By this Oath the Catholics only promised to submit quietly to the present Government of King George, to give no disturbance to it nor to assist any other directly or indirectly, to disturb it.

Secretary Craggs came to some of these conferences, and after having showed them that it was necessary the Catholics should do something to satisfy the King and deserve the protection of the Government, proposed to them this *Oath of Submission* and assured them that this would be enough. Mr. Craggs thought they would have no difficulty to take this Oath: yet to show the moderation of the King and Government told the Lords and Gentlemen they would not be required to take it, before they had consulted the Pope and had his approbation. What Mr. Craggs proposed seemed very fair and kind, but a *difficulty was started* how the Catholics could apply to Rome for a resolution of the case without running into a *Praemunire*, it being according to the laws a treasonable act to do it. It was resolved upon to refer the case to *Sir Edward Notheley*, the King's *Attorney General*. He told them it could not be done and added that should they have recourse to Rome, both they and he who advised them to it would incur the *Praemunire*. So this point dropped.

#### *The Case referred to the Clergy.*

(f. 7) As it seemed reasonable that the Catholics should give King George some satisfaction, the case of the Oath

<sup>1</sup> I have never found the formula of "an oath of submission with the word Allegiance omitted." If it exists, it would seem to have been circulated in private only.

<sup>2</sup> The "Oath of Allegiance," passed by James I., was an acutely persecuting measure. Some of its burdens are given in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. XI. pp. 177—180.

was remitted to Divines. It was particularly examined by the two Bishops, Giffard and Stonor, then a meeting was appointed at Bishop Giffard's lodgings and the heads of both Secular and Regular clergy were there, and all, excepting the *Friars*, were for the Oath, these would not give their opinion of it before they had consulted Bishop Pritchard.<sup>1</sup>

The 2 that seemed warmest for the Oath were Bishop Stonor and Abbé Strickland, both Doctors of Sorbonne, the latter afterwards Bishop of Namur. Mr. Strickland was thought later to be the Author of the Oath, and it was said that he was the person that first proposed it to the Government, and undertook to bring in all the Catholics to take it. It is certain he busied himself very much about the Oath, was often with the Ministers of State, went to Court and was graciously received. It was very confidently reported that King George writ to the Emperour in his favour to recommend him to the Denomination of the King of Poland, to a Cardinal's Cap. The favour showed him by King George emboldened him to make a journey to Rome (in 1719) to negotiate this affair, and what encouraged him to do this was a *Decree*, which *Santini, Internuncius at Brussels*, had sent over to Bp. Stonor.<sup>2</sup> This Prelate had been with the Internuncius to consult with him about taking an oath to the Government and to desire him to write to Rome to have the decision of the case. I cannot tell the time precisely when this happened but cannot doubt but Santini writ to Rome, had a decree from thence in favour of the Oath with this addition, that it was not only an oath Catholics might, but ought to take, first to deserve the protection of the Government, secondly to preserve Catholic families and Religion from ruin.

#### *Discussions at St. Germain's.*

(f. 8) The report of this meeting [at Bishop Giffard's lodgings] was soon heard at St. Germain's and was received

<sup>1</sup> Much information about the persons who figure in this history may be found in these reference books: James Gillow, *The Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics*; The Rev. John Kirk, D.D., *Biographies of English Catholics in the Eighteenth Century*, 1909. *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy*, 1883, by W. Maziere Brady. The latter gives full notices of all the Bishops; Kirk gives information of Dr. Ingleton, p. 136; of James Blake, p. 26, etc. A notice of James Craggs in *D.N.B.*

<sup>2</sup> The decree of Santini. Though some communication on this subject was under the consideration of Rome in the October of 1717, at the prayer of the Stuart court it was quietly withdrawn. Father Lawson, and others, were not unnaturally mystified, became very anxious, and feared that their whole party was in danger.

with indignation. My Ld. Middleton was the first I had it from, who told me that an oath had been approved of by all, both Bishops and Priests, excepting the Friars, by which we could not so much as pray for the King. Not knowing anything of the matter I writ immediately to f. Rich. Plowden, Provincial, to be informed. I had, in about a fortnight, an answer and f. Provincial told me there had been proposed an Oath of Submission in a meeting at Bishop Giffard's lodgings and that f. James Blake, his Vicar, had in submission to the Bishops and the rest allowed of it. But most of ours blamed him. He added that there was come from Rd f. General an order to our Province not to determine anything in the case of the Oath, but to submit to the Determination of the *Vicarii Apostolici*, who were appointed the Judges in these matters, he then told me that in case of need he would send me Authentical letters to prove that Bishops(?) Giffard and Stonor were for the Oath. This happened in the year 1717 whilst the Queen was at Chal-liot, a monastery of the Visitation Nuns.

The Oath was a very odious business and to cast all the ordure of it upon us, it was industriously spread about the Court, that we were the contrivers and only sticklers for it. Doctor Ingleton told me as much to my face, but was something confounded, when I replied before a good deal of company, that this was contrary to the account Ld. Middleton had given of it.

Believing this calumny had been carried to *the Queen*, at her return to *St. Germain's*, I thought proper to disabuse her Majesty, so waited upon her. She told me very frankly she had heard so, but did not believe it.

I then said I was afraid they would carry the same report to the King: she assured me that King James III. had too great an esteem and knowledge of us to believe them.

(f. 9) I acquainted her Majesty with what I had done and f. Provincial's answer to mine. She seemed very much satisfied but ordered me to write for those authentic letters he had promised. Accordingly I writ for them and they were sent to me and showed to the Queen with a letter from f. Blake which gave an account of what he had done and his reasons for it.

These letters were so satisfactory that the Queen ordered me to send them to the King, which I did, and his Majesty was pleased to thank me for them in his to the Queen.



But as our enemies had given out to make their calumny more probable that there was an intimate friendship between Mr. Strickland and our fathers, and that we had encouraged him to go and negotiate this affair at Rome, I thought it necessary to mention something in my letter to assure the King of the contrary, wherefore I told him that as Mr. Strickland had been very civil to us, we could not be otherwise than civil to him, but that there was no intimate friendship, for though he had told some of ours he was going to Rome, he never told them upon what design, and f. Provincial assured me he knew nothing of it, that he might have had letters from some of ours to their acquaintance in some Colleges upon the road but it was only to be civil to him. This is all I mentioned in my letter to the King, but as soon as I understood upon what business he went to Rome, I gave f. Eberson, then Rector of the English College, notice and f. Provincial did the same, and bid him be upon his guard not to be drawn into any negotiations about the Oath.

*The Pope's answer about Santini and Strickland.*

Soon after the King was obliged to quit France and to retire into Italy, he first went to Bologna as I take it, then to Urbino and then to Rome, but of this I am not sure. But it is certain he went to Rome (f. 10) as Pope Clement the 11th had taken him into his protection, would have nothing done that could give the King any uneasiness. He would not own<sup>1</sup> that any *Decree in favour of the Oath* had been sent to Santini and the only answer the Pope or Cardinals would give to Strickland who was come up, was "*consultant Theologos*" I mean upon the subject of the Oath of Allegiance.

This answer of the Pope and Cardinals was interpreted as a tacit approbation of the Oath, first because a clear approbation of it could not be given without offence of the King, whereas it would have been an agreeable compliment to condemn it had the Pope and Cardinals judged it unlawful. Moreover as the Catholics had recourse to Rome as to the Mother and Mistress of all churches and consequently to the proper judge in such controversy, the Pope seemed obliged in conscience to direct the Appellants and to secure them from imminent danger of falling into sin, which they would have

<sup>1</sup> Father Lawson was wrong not to have believed this. His further inferences are also mistaken.

been exposed to had the Oath proposed been unlawful. If then the Pope and Cardinals had judged it to be unlawful the Pope must have declared it so, and not have left it to decision of Divines, wherefore the court of Rome thought the faithful secure in conscience by following the opinion of Divines in this matter.

Mr. Strickland attempted several times to draw in f. Eber-son to his measures. He would have him at least get Cardinal Ptolomey's judgment of the case, but f. Eber-son prudently declined meddling in it.

Mr. Strickland not being able to get any other answer from the Pope and Cardinals than this *Consulant Theologos* he presented six propositions to the Congregation of Propaganda.

*The Propositions of the Abbé Strickland. (Latin.)*

1. "Whether it is allowable for the Catholics of England under the bond of an oath to promise to King George the peaceful possession of the realm, and acknowledgment by all ranks and that they will live quietly and peacefully under his rule.

2. That they will not help anyone against him either directly or indirectly.

3. That they will offer him true allegiance, or sincere obedience and fidelity; that is all those offices which, in the observation of the political and purely temporal laws of the realm, the King can require of his own right, and which the subject is bound to obey.

4. Whether it be not merely allowable but also a precept to utter an oath, if one be exacted of like condition, for the preservation of the Catholic faith.

5. Whether, as parliament and people claim for itself the same rights as Elective Kingdoms enjoy, that is of instituting a new form of empire, of changing the order of the succession, and of punishing with death those whom it decides to be disclaimers—whether Catholics may not and should not leave the whole thing to their arbitration and judgment.

6. Whether English Catholics cannot and should not in matters political and temporal, bear themselves in the same way as do those who live in Holland or in the lands of the Protestant princes in Germany."

It does not seem certain that Mr. Strickland presented

these Propositions to the Congregation. It is certain he designed to do it, and as certain he had no determining answer, if he did.

*The death of Queen Mary of Modena, 7 May, 1718.*

On the 7th of May, 1718, the Queen departed this life, and her pension from the Court of France ceased. And all her servants and the King's subjects were left without any farther support than the arrears of their pensions. The King indeed, out of his own stock allowed some small relief to as many as he could, not so much by way of a settled pension as out of charity, this made me think f. Maxwell and I should have been called from St. Germain's to the Province, not being able to render any service where we were, because Cardinal Noailles had taken away our faculties, as he had those of (f. 12) the French fathers *a year or two* before the Queen died. I also thought it would not look well in us, not being permitted to hear confessions, to live in a Catholic country out of a Jesuit College, or to be in this circumstance troublesome to the King or to the Province for maintenance. In the year '18 Patents came down from Rome, appointing me Rector of St. Omer's College, but f. Rich. Plowden still Provincial left it to f. William Darrell, f. Maxwell and to me, to judge whether it was proper for me to leave St. Germain's; and as both f. Darrell and f. Maxwell judging it not proper to leave it, f. Darrell was made Rector and we remained where we were.

About the end of this year, '19 as I take it, f. John Edisford was made Provincial, and when he came over in the year '20, he writ to me to meet him at St. Omer's, which I did at the end of July, we had a good deal of discourse about the Oath and I found our enemies had taken the same method in England to make us odious to the Government as they had in France to render us odious to the King. At St. Germain's they represented us the only sticklers for the Oath: in England, as the only opposers of it.

This so exasperated the Court against us that it was coming to a resolution, as my Ld. Stanhope Secretary of State told my Ld. Waldegrave, to banish us the Kingdom. F. Provincial applied to the ambassadors of Catholic Princes to protect us, and to appease the Court, assuring them that we were no sticklers for or against the Oath, having an Order from Father General to determine nothing in this matter, but

to follow the determination of the Apostolical Vicars, to whom it belonged to decide what was to be done in such cases.

*A term put to the discussion.*

Upon threats of the Government f. Provincial was obliged to have divers consultations with ours, and as f. Eccleston who was at them told me, all excepting two, were of opinion that we not only might but ought to satisfy the Government. F. Provincial showed me a letter he designed to send to the King, and I have some notion it was sent, and that King did not (f. 13) disapprove of what he had done. But I doubt whether the letter was ever sent, because f. Provincial died soon after, that is upon the 13th of August, 1720, and f. Tho. Parker, who was left vice-Provincial, was absolutely against the Oath. So this puts an end to my *Historical Account*, for after this controversy about the Oath ceased, no more was said, and we were quiet for a time, till Mr. Strickland's [*revived*] scheme raised a storm.<sup>1</sup>

*Final Remarks.*

But I will conclude with a Remark I made during the time this affair of the Oath of Allegiance and Submission was agitated. I observed that some of those that refused the Oath of Allegiance were disposed to take it, had these words "True Allegiance" signified no more than bare submission, or a promise to give no disturbance to the Government, nor to give assistance to anyone to disturb it.

Another recollection. "In the year 1701 I went first into the Mission with f. Joseph Wakeman, a learned and moderate man. The Oath being tendered to him, and boggling at the word Allegiance, he said that if it means no more than to be quiet and give no disturbance to the Government, I am ready to take it, but being told it implied a faithful compliance with all the duties of a subject to his Sovereign he refused the Oath, and paid his 40 shillings."<sup>2</sup>

[Signed] THOMAS LAWSON.

(*To be continued.*)

J. H. POLLEN.

<sup>1</sup> N.P. The scheme of which we have heard before, in 1719, had passed away; but in 1720 the Abbé Strickland proposed to accomplish the same objects through Vienna. [Ed.]

<sup>2</sup> Forty shillings was the normal fine for refusing the oath by 1 W. and M. § 8.

## OUR CATHOLIC POPULATION AGAIN

"**T**HOU hast multiplied the nation and hast not increased the joy," is the reading of the Vulgate text of Isaiah ix. 3. Quality is better than quantity, or in other words we cannot safely estimate the strength of a movement by the number of its ostensible adherents. Figures also in such cases are apt to be very unreliable, if not actually misleading, and it too often happens that discussions and arguments which are based upon anything in the nature of a religious census prove utterly futile, ministering only to a false sense of security which is deplorable in its consequences.

None the less there are occasions when it seems desirable for Catholics to try and clear up their ideas as to the problem of numerical progress or retrogression. Exaggerated optimism and exaggerated pessimism are almost equally harmful in their effect upon the *moral* of the energetic workers who generously give their time to the propagation of Catholic Truth. Moreover, there are the critics to be met, who are very busy in spreading the idea that when judged by its results "the new Italian Mission" in England (and America) has been a failure. They continue to assert, as Edward Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, contended in a famous pastoral so far back as 1891, that "in all these years she (the new Italian Mission) has effected here a multiplication of edifices and institutions, but not of souls; that she makes no statistical progress." There is an element of truth in this, no doubt, but there is a still stronger colouring of misrepresentation. The most unfortunate feature of the case lies in the ill-considered generalizations of well-meaning Catholics who without serious study of the available evidence enunciate contradictory conclusions in accordance with their temperament or prejudices. A striking illustration of these extremes is afforded by a short article in the February number of the *Catholic World*, where certain views adopted by Mr. Hilaire Belloc and Father T. Donnelly, S.J., are contrasted with some extremely optimistic estimates of Father Pius Carolan, C.P. In the absence of any fuller report, I must assume that the summary of the American periodical

1

is substantially accurate. Let us take first the pronouncement attributed to my Jesuit confrère which has at least the merit of being quite definite.

Father Terence Donnelly, S.J. [says the writer], who for years has made a special study of the subject, seems to have reached the conclusion that the Church in England is barely holding its own, if not actually losing ground. In a lecture delivered recently to the Catholic students of London University, he declared that after the great increment caused by the Irish and French immigrations and the early Tractarian conversions—that is to say by the time of the restoration of the Hierarchy—Catholics stood at one-eighteenth of the population of Great Britain. To-day, he maintains, notwithstanding all the conversions of seventy-five years, Catholics stand at only one-nineteenth of the population. The latter figure is based on the commonly held belief, supported by the statistics given in *The Catholic Directory*, that the Catholics of Great Britain [*lege* England and Wales<sup>1</sup>] number about two millions.<sup>2</sup>

This, of course, means that Catholicism instead of gaining ground has not even kept pace with the natural increase of the population. But are the data reliable, and is the inference justified? I may confess that I do not find myself in any way able to subscribe to these conclusions. They seem to me to be open to criticism from more than one point of view.

And to begin with, what is the nature of the evidence which is held to prove that at the time of the restoration of the Hierarchy (say 1850-1851) Catholics formed one-eighteenth of the population of England and Wales? In the census of 1851 the inhabitants enumerated in this section of the Empire were 17,927,609, roughly 18 millions, and if we may claim an eighteenth part of that total this would give us a Catholic population of just one million. That this very probably did represent the true state of the case, I am not prepared to deny, but it is important to notice that the estimate is based, not upon any official report of the bishops, nor upon the returns of the parish clergy, nor upon the number of Easter Communions, or the attendance at Sunday Mass, and still less upon the statistics of Catholic marriages, but simply upon a calculation of the number of Catholic baptisms. No one has ever given more careful attention to the subject

<sup>1</sup> The tables in the *Catholic Directory* take no account of Scotland.

<sup>2</sup> *The Catholic World*, Feb. 1924, p. 681.



before us than the late Father John Morris, who published the results of his researches in several very interesting and important articles in this Review during the years 1890, 1891 and 1892.<sup>1</sup> In pursuing his investigations Father Morris, who before he entered the Society of Jesus had been a Canon of Northampton and secretary to Cardinal Wiseman, possessed the great advantage of a first-hand knowledge of the Westminster archives and of an intimate personal acquaintance with Cardinal Manning and most of the Bishops of the English Hierarchy. From them he obtained access, as his articles bear witness, to many statistical papers which would not be at the disposition of an ordinary inquirer. Now in all his articles I can find no trace of any figures which would throw light upon the position of affairs in 1850-1851, except a statement regarding the Catholic baptisms of that date, and a reference to the Registrar General's returns for marriages.<sup>2</sup> Father Morris records that about the year 1837 the Vicars Apostolic estimated the Catholic population of England and Wales at about 400,000. If the numbers in the course of the next 14 years expanded to a million, this is a prodigious increase, but the Irish famine, and, to some small extent, the conversions which followed in the wake of the Tractarian movement, will have contributed to this result. That the Irish immigration must have helped very considerably to swell the Catholic population of this country follows inevitably from the census returns of each decennial period. A paragraph in the General Report for the census of 1911 sums the matter up as follows. Out of every 100,000 of the population of England and Wales the number of persons born in Ireland was

in 1851 ...	2900	in 1891 ...	1580
in 1861 ...	2999	in 1901 ...	1317
in 1871 ...	2493	in 1911 ...	1041 <sup>3</sup>
in 1881 ...	2165		

<sup>1</sup> See THE MONTH, Aug. 1890, "The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster"; March, 1891, "Archbishop Benson's Pastoral"; March, April, May, 1892, "Catholic England in Modern Times."

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Thomas Murphy's essay on *The Position of the Catholic Church in England and Wales during the last Two Centuries* contains no information which supplements the figures supplied by Father Morris. Neither can I find anything to the purpose in Bishop Ward's very valuable *Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*.

<sup>3</sup> See the *General Report* for the Census of 1911, p. 205. This volume, though it deals with the figures collected in 1911, was only published in 1917. The corresponding volume for the Census of 1921 has not yet appeared, but from details given regarding the Ireland-born population of such great centres as London, Lancashire, and Yorkshire, I gather that the number of Irish immigrants was greater in 1921 than in 1911.

From this it will be readily seen that if in 1851, 2,900 out of every hundred thousand of the population were born in Ireland, the total number of persons of Irish birth then resident in England must have totalled roughly  $180 \times 2,900$ , or in other words, about 522,000.<sup>1</sup> Some of these, of course, will have been Protestants from Ulster, but the vast majority, *i.e.*, nearly four-fifths, were baptized Catholics. No doubt we must not infer that all these immigrants had made their way into England since the famine. There has at all times, going back even to the period of Bishop Challoner, been a large admixture of Irish Catholics in our English congregations, and if, as is unquestionably the fact, Liverpool as early as 1810 was a great Catholic centre, it was to the Irish immigrants that its numerical importance was mainly due.<sup>2</sup> It will also have been noticed that ten years later, in 1861, the number of residents in England and Wales who had actually been born in the sister isle had risen to the very verge of 3 per cent. (2,999 in 100,000), and the total number of such persons in the whole country was set down in the census returns as 580,487. This alone presupposes an Irish Catholic population in 1861 of well over 400,000, and we have to add to them, of course, the number of their surviving children and grandchildren born since their residence on English soil. In the light of these facts it is impossible to ignore the importance of the Irish immigration, and I am quite disposed to allow that in 1851 the total number of baptized Catholics did not probably fall far short of a million souls. Still, the only direct evidence for that conclusion is apparently to be found in the following statement made by Father Morris in 1890. "From general returns contributed by all the Bishops more than twenty years ago, we learn that in 1850 the baptisms in England were 34,539 and the marriages 5,152, while in 1865 the baptisms were 55,230 and the marriages 8,579."<sup>3</sup> Now we may learn from the Registrar General's 13th Report, issued in 1852, that the total number of births in 1850 was 593,422; from which it follows that just one-seventeenth part of the whole number of children born in that year were baptized in Catholic

<sup>1</sup> The more exact figure was 519,000.

<sup>2</sup> In *The Tablet* for Jan. 24, 1914, p. 124, I have quoted some Liverpool statistics, which show *inter alia* that in 1832 when the total baptisms in that city were 7,767, the Catholic baptisms numbered 1,980, more than a fourth of the whole.

<sup>3</sup> *THE MONTH*, Aug. 1890, p. 459. Where these returns made by the English bishops are preserved and in what year they were computed, Father Morris does not state.

churches, suggesting the further conclusion that Catholics then formed one-seventeenth part of the population of England and Wales.

Are the figures quoted by Father Morris reliable? I must confess that I do not feel entirely satisfied upon the point, and for this reason. While the Bishops set down the number of baptisms in 1850 at 34,539 (a figure which we have no means of checking) they also give 5,152 as the number of marriages. But in the Registrar General's Report the marriages celebrated with Roman Catholic rites are returned as 5,623, a discrepancy which is not easily accounted for except upon the supposition of considerable negligence in keeping the Catholic registers.<sup>1</sup> However, the error may in a sense be considered to be upon the right side. It points to the fact that the clergy were sometimes neglectful in making the proper entries in the registers, and that the figures they returned consequently fell short of, rather than exceeded, the actual number of ritual offices performed.

But while the number of baptisms in 1850 undoubtedly accords with the supposition of a Catholic population of about a million souls, forming one-seventeenth or one-eighteenth part of the entire community, still it is much to be feared that at that date, as at present, the Catholicism of many was little more than nominal. Two facts may be adduced in support of this view. The first is that the Catholic marriages, as we have just learned from the Registrar General, numbered only 5,623, while the total number of marriages in England and Wales amounted to 152,738. If we adopted this as our test, we should be led to the conclusion that Catholics formed, not one-seventeenth, but one-twenty-seventh, part of the total population. Secondly it is to be noted that in the year 1851, an official attempt was made on Sunday, March 30th, to take a religious census of England and Wales. The people who attended church were counted, and the results of this enumeration were subsequently analysed and published by authority. Dealing with Catholic places of worship, the Report states that—

The number of attendants on the Census Sunday (making an

<sup>1</sup> Father Morris himself also occasionally makes slips. For instance, in *THE MONTH*, Aug. 1890, p. 459, he states that in the Westminster diocese the marriages were 581 in 1850, and 1,164 in 1865. But in May, 1892, p. 29, he mentions that the conditional baptisms in the same diocese numbered 581 in 1850, and 1,164 in 1865. There surely must be some confusion here.

estimated addition for 27 chapels, the returns from which are silent on the point) was, Morning 252,783, Afternoon 53,967, Evening 76,880. It will be observed that in the morning, the number of attendants was more than the number of sittings; this is explained by the fact that in many Roman Catholic chapels, there is more than one morning service, attended by different individuals.<sup>1</sup>

From this statement, I fancy, there can be little doubt that the number of Catholics who actually heard Mass on that particular Sunday must have been considerably less than 250,000. The enumerators simply counted those present at each service, without attempting the impossible task of distinguishing those who were present at two services or three. Relatively to the practice of our own day it was a church-going age, and it is certain that many pious persons who had communicated at one of the early Masses of that fourth Sunday of Lent will also have been present at the late Mass with its sermon, thus being counted twice over. Thus I much doubt if the number of individual Catholics who heard Mass on the day specified can notably have exceeded 200,000. There is, however, another striking passage in the preface to the same Report which throws light upon the conditions which prevailed in the Catholic chapels of that date. Among the instructions given to the enumerators they were directed to ascertain—"whether the service was conducted in a separate building, or in a portion merely, as a room—whether it was used exclusively for public worship—the date at which it was erected or first appropriated to its present use—and (with exclusive reference to Roman Catholic chapels) the space allotted as *standing-room* for worshippers."<sup>2</sup> Clearly it must then have been notorious that Catholics were distinguished from other religious denominations by the fact that for many of their worshippers only standing-room was available.

The situation, then, as I conceive it, was this. In the middle of the last century the Catholic Church in England which, like a convalescent after a long illness, was only very gradually gaining strength and confidence in its newly found freedom, was more or less abruptly confronted with a very considerable increase in numbers. There were a multitude

<sup>1</sup> H. Mann, *Religious Worship in England and Wales*, abridged from the Official Report (1854), pp. 44–45.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* Preface, p. vi. The words *standing-room* are italicized in the original.

of Irish immigrants, for the most part the poorest of the poor; there was a small but steady influx of converts, people of education, no doubt, but rarely possessed of any exceptional share of this world's goods; and finally, there were a good many foreigners, partly driven to England by the political disturbances on the Continent in 1848 and 1849, partly attracted hither by the Great Exhibitions of 1851 and 1862, and by the cosmopolitan atmosphere which such men as Prince Albert and Napoleon III. had helped to create. The Catholic Bishops of England were unfortunately by no means in a position to cope with this sudden demand upon their resources. They had neither sufficient clergy, nor sufficient church accommodation, nor adequate poor schools. All these are things which cannot be called into existence at a moment's notice. It was the work of nearly half a century before these needs could be supplied in such measure as was necessary for efficient parochial administration. Meanwhile, undoubtedly many fell away. They were strangers in the land, they were inclined to be indolent and slack in their religious observances, the clergy who alone could supply encouragement or remedy were few in number and overworked. There followed consequently a long period of apparent numerical stagnation. Although no systematic returns are available giving the total number of Catholic baptisms in England as a whole, still the figures which Father Morris obtained from the Bishops in 1891 show clearly that between 1865 and 1885 or 1890 the number of baptisms in several of the most important dioceses, instead of increasing proportionately with the growth of the population, had remained constant, or fluctuated, or even diminished. In the diocese of Birmingham, for example, the baptisms in 1883 were 3,616 and in 1890, 3,461. In Newcastle there were 6,469 baptisms in 1875 and only 6,159 in 1889. In Westminster the 7,975 infant baptisms recorded in 1865, had fallen to an average of 6,891 for the years 1875-80 and to 7,208 in 1889.<sup>1</sup> With regard to marriages, Mr. Gladstone in his pamphlet on *The Vatican Decrees* (published November, 1874) made capital out of this apparent stagnation in the following passage:

Rumours have gone about that the proportion of members of

<sup>1</sup> THE MONTH, May, 1892, pp. 29-31. Of course the decline of the birth-rate contributed to this, though Catholics were less affected thereby than the country at large.

the Papal Church to the population has increased, especially in England. But these rumours would seem to be confuted by authentic figures. The Roman Catholic marriages, which supply a competent test and which were 4.89 per cent of the whole in 1854, and 4.62 per cent in 1859, were 4.09 per cent in 1869, 4.02 per cent in 1871, and 4.01 per cent in 1872.<sup>1</sup>

To this Bishop Ullathorne replied—and it seems to me that his contention was substantially justified by the facts—

The decrease is explained from another cause than diminished conversions. A very large immigration of Catholics from Ireland took place in consequence of the terrible famine which desolated that country; whilst of late years that immigration has diminished until it has almost ceased. But the stream of Irish emigration from England to America and Australia still flows on. For this reason one would expect the diminution of Catholic marriages in England to be considerably more than it proves to be.<sup>2</sup>

Without attempting to deny the existence of a considerable domestic leakage due to mere slackness, there can be no question that at this period a large number of the Irish immigrants who had settled in England for a while found their way ultimately to the United States or the colonies to join relatives and friends who had prospered beyond the seas. But another cause also was then at work which suggests that any calculation as to the numerical position of Catholics which was based on the statistics of baptisms alone required to be handled very carefully. I refer to the enormous infant mortality which then prevailed in just those congested urban districts of Liverpool, London, Gosport, Cardiff, etc., where the Irish immigrants principally settled down. Dr. William Farr, F.R.S., one of the founders in England of the science of vital statistics, referring in an official report to the conditions which existed in the United Kingdom before 1865, remarks:

Even in the healthy districts of the country, out of one million children born, 175,410 die in the first five years of life; but in the Liverpool district, which serves to represent the most unfavourable sanitary conditions, out of the same number born, 460,370, or nearly half the number born, die in the five years following their birth.<sup>3</sup>

This speaks for itself. There was undoubtedly an

<sup>1</sup> *Vatican Decrees*, etc. Collected Ed., 1875, p. lxxiii.

<sup>2</sup> *Mr. Gladstone's Expostulation Unravell'd*, p. 37.

<sup>3</sup> Farr, *Vital Statistics*, p. 204.



enormous infant mortality among the poor immigrants who settled in the slums of Liverpool, London and the other great towns, but they were probably conscientious in procuring baptism for even the most sickly of their offspring. In those days, the public opinion of Protestants as well as of Catholics was loud in bewailing the misfortune of the babe who died without baptism. Moreover, public opinion counts for much in the slums, and influences considerably the conduct of the careless. For that generation the modern neglect of religious observances had not yet come into vogue. Hence I do not doubt that the number of Catholic baptisms did in the fifties correspond pretty accurately to the number of Catholic births. There is now much reason to fear that the offspring of nominally Catholic parents are sometimes never presented at the font at all. Consequently the baptisms recorded in the returns published from Archbishop's House in recent years seem to me to supply on the whole the most satisfactory material we have for arriving at an estimate of the number of those who can be counted as Catholics by conviction, even though careless in practice.

And this is the main point of my present paper. Although it may be true that an eighteenth, or even a seventeenth, part of the population in 1851 professed allegiance to Rome, it seems to me impossible to subscribe to the opinion that at the present day the proportion of Catholics has actually diminished, and that throughout England and Wales only one citizen out of nineteen would call himself by that name. If there were a million Catholics in 1851, and something less than 250,000 attended Mass, they were certainly not all of them creditable representatives of the religion which they professed. There is perhaps less excuse for non-attendance at Mass now-a-days when there is vastly more church accommodation even relatively to our increased numbers, but if we apply the same standard in including those whose profession of our Faith is little more than nominal, I believe that if a religious census were taken to-day, more than three millions of our fellow citizens would write themselves down as R.C. For let us look at the figures. According to the *Catholic Directory*, the Infant Baptisms and the Marriages entered in our registers during the last four years, for which returns are available, stand as follows:

	1919	1920	1921	1922
Infant Baptisms	58,092	77,721	73,322	70,349
Marriages ...	21,751	23,940	20,866	20,159

Now if we take the figures from the Registrar General's returns of Births, Deaths and Marriages, we find the total of births and the total of marriages in England and Wales during the same four years given as follows:

	1919	1920	1921	1922
Births ...	692,438	957,782	848,814	780,187
Marriages	369,411	379,982	320,852	299,360

Beginning with the latest year, 1922, a very simple calculation shows that if there were 780,187 infants born in that year, and 70,349 of these were baptized with Catholic rites, an eleventh part of this new generation of children were Catholic children. From this the natural, if crude, inference would be that Catholics now form one-eleventh of the population of the country, or, remembering the census total of 37,885,242 in 1921, we might thence deduce that 3,426,961 inhabitants of England and Wales may be counted as professing obedience to the See of Rome. If the proportion of Catholic baptisms to total births in 1922 notably exceeded the ratio observed in other recent years, we might be more disposed to question the conclusion just suggested, but although 1922 yields the most favourable figures, the three preceding years indicate, when similarly dealt with, that the Catholic baptisms always number very nearly one-twelfth of the total of children born. This is very much in excess of that proportion of one-eighteenth or one-seventeenth in 1851 which was arrived at by precisely the same method, and I would urge that with such figures before us it certainly cannot be maintained that Catholicism in the last 70 years has not gained, but is losing ground.

The conclusions suggested by the returns of Catholic marriages are no doubt less flattering. If we could use the actual entries in the registers without modification we should obtain more favourable results, but unfortunately a good many of these entries are, beyond question, only the record of marriages which have been "put right" by renewing the contract before the parish priest and witnesses after it had been wrongly entered upon in a civil registry or in an Anglican church. Seeing that in 1919 we know that the Registrar General vouches for 19,078 Catholic marriages where our own registers record a total of 21,751, we shall probably be right in assuming that if we deduct one-eighth from our marriage figures, we shall have approximately the number which would be recognized by English law as valid

unions, contracted for the first time. Applying this to the figures of the year 1922, we should have about 17,640 (out of 20,159) which were duly recognized by the Registrar General, and comparing this result with the total of marriages in England and Wales, 299,360, we might thence deduce that 5.89 per cent. of the marriages celebrated in 1922 were Catholic marriages, and that our Catholic population consequently numbered some 2,240,000 souls. If anyone should ask why the figures derived from our baptismal registers are so much more encouraging than the statistics of Catholic marriages, the very simple answer seems to be that while there is hardly any reason, beyond mere slackness, for a man failing to have his children baptized, there are a dozen motives at least, which may lead him to contract an irregular marriage in defiance of the prohibitions imposed by God and the Church.

Of course it must be fully admitted that, as I have pointed out elsewhere, many corrections and qualifications have to be allowed for in reasoning along these lines, more especially on account of that very uncertain factor in the case, the proportion of mixed marriages.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, when all deductions have been made I may venture to record here my personal conviction that the number of those residents in England and Wales who may fairly be counted as professing Catholics considerably exceeds 2,500,000, and that the number of those in this country who have at some time or other received Catholic baptism may be safely estimated at over 3,000,000. I cannot, however, in any way endorse the calculation of Father Pius, C.P., who apparently would more than double this last estimate, but on the other hand it seems desirable to point out that while it is the irreligious and the slackers who for the most part fall away from their religious practices, the 11,000 or 12,000 converts who for the last 15 or 20 years have annually made their submission to the Catholic Church in this country are constantly found to be among the most fervent and edifying of her members.

HERBERT THURSTON.

<sup>1</sup> For lack of space I must be content here to refer to what I have written in *The Tablet*, Jan. 17th and 24th, 1914, and Feb. 11th, 1922; and *THE MONTH*, Dec., 1921, p. 542.

## MATERIAL FOR A STORY

HE was a lad of parts, Ned Thornton was, but some of his parts seemed to remain perennially asleep. During his Freshman year at Santa Cruz, he was frequently assailed by various admonitors, calling him to work, especially to report promptly with his written exercises. Some of these admonitory voices were a tinkling cymbal, he was accustomed to remark, and others were of sounding brass. The Dean of Santa Cruz combined all varieties, when Ned's class reports were entered at the office. The Dean's tongue seemed made of vibrant steel, cutting as well as sonorous, sometimes when it met due occasion, rising to the pitch of a siren in an ocean fog. Students became accustomed to the tones, minor and major, of that voice, and they would linger in the corridor whenever Ned Thornton was summoned *ad audiendum verbum*.

"He does the chromatic scales very easily," Ned remarked with a pleasant smile one evening to his room-mate, MacDonough Ward.

"Well, quit your dreaming, and you'll hear less of him," Mac replied. Ward acted as a sort of Horatio to his friend, but always with a judicious sympathy, for he knew that Ned had the making of the courtier, the scholar and the soldier in him. Mac had seen the Prep. School report which Ned had brought with him to Santa Cruz. It contained, besides the numerical statements about Ned's achievements in class, the following note by the Head Master: "Edward, though dilatory and speculative, is capable of practical performances; occasions at school witnessed the excellence of his talents, when his hands and will responded to the vigour of his mind."

Yet the teachers at Santa Cruz, though they could not exorcise Ned's spirit of procrastination, toned their reports of him with an understanding kindliness. They had to note the limited amount of written work, but they saw compensation in his oral recitations. Said one of them to another when they were scanning one of Ned's equivocal reports: "After all, there are larks in the world as well as sparrows. Larks go up higher, see more of the earth, and in the light and air of heaven they give a service that is a delight to the world."

But the Dean preferred the sparrows; he looked for steady little facts and figures that could be counted up arithmetic-

ally; his eyes did not gaze at rainbows or follow bubbles of prophecy. Such was the Dean, Father Melling. He had Ned Thornton's measure, all in figures, like a tailor's chart for a suit of clothes.

"Father Melling has your number," Ward said one day, in his character of mentor. "He has weighed you and found you short. Here we are, Sunday evening, and you must hand in a story to-morrow morning. Yet you have not as much as put pen to paper." MacDonough Ward was his room-mate, and played Horatio to his friend.

"Can't write a story without a subject," said Ned nonchalantly, and smiled.

"The Dean will tell you something that is not a story," Mac replied. "You may look for a concert at the office next Wednesday morning when the reports go in."

"A din in the den of the Dean, eh?" said Ned with a laugh, then noting a shade of sadness pass over his friend's face, he added, "Don't worry, old man, the story will be on time if I stay up all night for it."

Then he left the room and sped along the corridor towards the room of Mr. Graham. Now Mr. Graham was a teacher at Santa Cruz, and a prefect in the hall where Ned Thornton lived, and in both these capacities had a faculty of winning the respect and confidence of his varied clientèle. Boys came to him knowing he would understand them and sympathize.

"Here comes Ned Thornton; I know his step," he said to himself before the boy knocked; and then looking up at his visitor, he added, "The late Edward Thornton: wants permission to stay up to-night, I guess."

"I must present a story in class to-morrow morning," Ned began meekly. "I can work better when things are quiet, Mr. Graham."

"But do you wake better when you've had less sleep?" asked Mr. Graham pointedly. "However; take an extra hour. But be in time for chapel." Mr. Graham then took up his pen as if to indicate that the interview was over, but he had a discerning eye and saw that Ned had something more to say, so his "good-night" was more friendly than peremptory.

"Good-night, sir," said Ned, and, as he turned to go, added, "I wonder if you could, or rather if you would, give me a suggestion; I want material for my story."

"What!" ejaculated the teacher, "You, Ned Thornton, who have lived in New York and Washington, you who have

travelled up and down Europe, you asking for material for a short story, for a mere class exercise!"

"Oh, I can arrange the landscape and backgrounds," the boy replied; "that'll be easy enough. But I want something for a foreground, some figure, some incident."

"Any incident, any commonplace incident, must suffice for you now." Mr. Graham again glanced towards the clock. "Set your little event in some foreign place, up among the Alps, for you have been there, or dig up something that will fit among the ruins in the Roman Forum, for you have been there, or take a theme from a ballad out of Ireland, for you have been there. And now ——" The teacher was laughing, even as he took Ned by the arm to accompany him to the door.

"Oh, please, Mr. Graham," Ned protested, "Time's short and my mind's a blank. A suggestion to set me going. Please."

"You've been in Paris, too;" Mr. Graham was yielding.

"Yes, sir," said Ned, tempting him further; "and I went down to Angers where you once studied, and I saw the old Roman ruins you spoke about, and the huge windmills beckoning on into Brittany, and the great bridge across the Loire. You have told us that the foundations of that bridge were made by Julius Cæsar. But, Mr. Graham, did anything happen to you there, or in Paris?"

"Sit down, Ned," was the reply. "You said you were once at our Vaugirard college." It was plain that the teacher was beating out a pathway to an incident. "And you and your mother stopped to see our former house, in the 'Rue de Sevres.'"

Ned knew his aim was accomplished, and kept a discreet silence.

"Well, now that I mention the 'Rue de Sevres,'" Mr. Graham went on, "in the very parlour, the reception room which your mother and you visited, a little incident occurred some years ago, and you may make something out of it, since you can lead up to it with your traveller's notes, and come away from it by a gateway of reflection."

"Yes, yes, sir," Ned sat forward anxiously. "Was it long ago?"

"Seventy years ago. That's it; make it definite and real, say, seventy-four years ago. A young Jesuit novice was acting as porter on a certain day. Yet he was not so very young. He had made college studies, had a bit of experience



in the legal profession. Pierre Olivaint was his name. A lady came to the door, showing all the externals of refinement in dress and adornment. Brother Olivaint ushered her to the parlour and asked her business. Then, suddenly, in a shrill tone, and with words of bitter reproach, she assailed him, cursed the habit he wore, and included in her maledictions the whole sacerdotal body. 'They have stolen my daughter away from me,' she cried, 'one of your priests here has bewitched my daughter away from her happy home.' Brother Olivaint tried to quiet the clamour of the visitor, saying that he would go to fetch one of the Fathers. 'No,' she shrieked, 'no, I do not want to see any other of your black stuff. You are all of the same piece. You all inveigled my daughter, my sweet little child, away from me, away into a cold and heartless convent.' Now, then, Ned Thornton, go ahead and make an ending for that. How would you arrange a satisfactory exit?" Mr. Graham pretended that he had finished his contribution to the belated exercise.

"How should I end that scene?" asked Ned. "I should call for Father Melling." The boy was smiling with becoming propriety. Everybody at Santa Cruz was allowed to enjoy a reference to the Dean's vigorous voice. "I should arrange for somebody like the Dean to come in and give her tit for tat, and shout her out of the house. Still, Brother Olivaint couldn't do that, sir, could he? Do tell me what he actually did."

"Well, Brother Olivaint kept his peace; he allowed the poor distracted grief of the mother to abate a bit, and then he advanced a word of consolation, saying that the little daughter must surely have obtained her mother's generous consent to go to the convent, and that the good God would reward the sacrifice of the mother and child." Mr. Graham would like to have delayed over the incident, but he eyed the clock again, and made a show of speed. "Well, the mother seemed to find in these words of Brother Olivaint a new cue for her clamours. She shook her fist at the calm novice, snapped her fingers in his face, and said with a bitter sneer, 'Don't try any of your pious cant on me. What if I did consent to let my daughter go, it was the only way to save her from dying under the moral poison that had been administered to her, doses of this religious dope of yours. Bah! what do you know about love, you heartless folk in your black gowns? You never have known what it is to lose a daughter. What do you know about love?' But," Mr.

Graham raised a hand when he noticed that Ned was ready to put a question, "but Brother Olivaint had a ready answer. Meekly, but firmly, he said, 'Pardon me, madam, I do know what love is. I know the love of my own dear mother, my mother who loved yet parted with me. You have lost a daughter; I have left my mother. I know what love costs, what love pays for love.' And he turned aside to hide his emotion."

"And what did the lady say to that?" Ned asked.

"The simple words had a wonderful effect upon her," said Mr. Graham, as he rose and moved towards the door, "or perhaps it was the saintly personality that uttered them. Anyhow after a moment's silence, she suddenly knelt at the feet of the novice, though he protested, and begged her to allow him to summon one of the Fathers now. But she would not have it so. She begged his pardon with obvious sincerity, asked him for a blessing, and departed with an air of radiant joy. And it was a joy which lasted;" Mr. Graham was whispering now, as the two walked slowly down the corridor; "for she went directly to see her daughter at Angers,—do you recall the convent on the hill across the bridge to the south?—and years afterwards, when the daughter with other Sisters from that convent were sent to China, that mother paid the travelling expenses all the way for the little band. And so, good-night, Ned, and good luck to your literary efforts."

But Ned went empty-handed to class on the following morning, save for the text books that seemed constantly ready to slip from his fingers. The fact was he had too much material for a mere class-exercise. His imagination had been captivated and his heart won by the glimpse of the youth of a saint. He begged his teacher for two days of grace on behalf of the story. Even then, so much had he read that he had only reached the door of the "Rue de Sevres" on his paper; but he had a plan to show, an extended forecast of the whole account. And the Wednesday report was sufficient to save him from Father Melling's objurgations. In all, it took him another week before he dried the lady's tears at a door of the "Rue de Sevres." "Not a bad little story," whispered the dreamer to himself, as he blotted the last words—a judgment which the teacher endorsed as he read it to a group after class. And the energy thus aroused maintained itself and was exercised in more important literary displays, the June Academy, for instance, and the

Governor's reception. It was not until nearly the end of the school year that Mr. Graham learnt that Ned's interest in Pierre Olivaint was unabated. At the end of a conversation on school prospects the lad suddenly said, "Coming again to Brother Olivaint, I have been wondering what talents he showed later in life. Did he have a notable career?"

"He was great in life, but greater in death," replied the teacher.

"Oh!" Ned ejaculated. "Perhaps I could use another incident in his life, say next year when I return, and try to make a decent showing in the Sophomore class."

"Another incident?" Mr. Graham was questioning his own memory. "Olivaint's character is apparent in many incidents. But you would best appreciate it if you read his retreat notes, and his notes during his days in jail."

"In jail?" Ned was eager for material for another story.

"Yes, during the French Commune," Mr. Graham replied, with a show of nonchalance, which was really a veil covering his deep sympathy. "Next year, that is after you return in September, you can read something about the great Frenchman, but I'm afraid only in French. Nothing but sketchy things have appeared in English concerning him."

"But why wait till next term?" urged Ned: "tell me something now which I may work up into a story during the summer months, and," with a merry laugh, "surprise the Dean with when I return."

"Well, strange enough, it is back again to the 'Rue de Sevres' we must go, when Père Olivaint was stationed at the end. The Commune was in being, with its accompaniment of wild riots, flaming buildings, massacres and desecration—all the crime with nothing of the idealism of the first Republic. You have visited Notre Dame; you saw in that rear chapel of relics the riddled cassock of Monseigneur Darboy. Well, the 'Rue de Sevres' had its page of blood also. Father Olivaint, as I hinted, was one of the clerics marked for jail and for the added doom of death. And, I say, Ned, sometime you may read those notes he made during the imprisonment, little notes indeed, compressed into the narrow margins of his breviary. He was not afraid to give his head once to the guillotine, since he had sacrificed his heart every morning at the Altar. But you want an incident, as nucleus for a story. Well, the time came to take the clerical prisoners from the dungeon to their death. Olivaint was one

of the special victims. He was led forth, his left hand manacled to the right of a companion. A wild rabble accompanied them. Insult in its vilest vocabulary and tone assailed them all the way. As they approached the wall and the ditch where they were to be shot, a coarse girl of the streets, a virago of the under-world, pushed through the blaspheming rabble, and, as a conclusion to her own jeers, spat in the face of Father Olivaint. He was quick with a reply, ready with a benign smile, prompt with a characteristic gesture. He raised his right hand and said, 'My daughter, I bless you in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost!'

"Did she too fall at his feet like the other woman?" asked Ned quickly.

"She would have fallen under a hundred feet, if she had not kept her own," Mr. Graham replied. "No, she marched on at the outer edge of the mob. She watched with an eager eye every incident of the execution, counted the shots, noted the part of the fosse wherein they threw the lifeless body of Father Olivaint. And at midnight, when everybody had departed, this poor girl returned, dug away the earth with her bare hands, took out the body of Olivaint, carried it on her shoulders to the 'Rue de Sevres,' deposited her sacred burden into venerating hands, and went off with her sorrowing tears into the night."

When September came, Mr. Graham had departed from Santa Cruz; he was engaged in theological studies in Stockwood. Ned returned to the college, as Sophomore, to all seeming a model of diligence, which did not, however, save him from the criticism of his friend Ward.

"Keep your desk free from all that truck about the French Commune of Seventy-One. Keep it, I say, for your holidays. You seem to be specializing in French literature, but you must meet M. T. Cicero in rhetoric, and H-two-O in chemistry, and other wild-fowl that take no stock of French."

But documents about the Paris of Olivaint's times, and books about Olivaint and by Olivaint continued to hold the forefront of Ned's desk. However, in nooks and corners there were other books, and class-exercises were not neglected; in fact the Dean had to break all precedents before the Christmas holiday in congratulating Ned on the figures in the office ledger. Mr. Graham was kept acquainted with some of the happenings at Santa Cruz.

Letters came to him: "Thornton read a paper at the Academy on The Last French Commune . . . Thornton hardly lets a night go past, or even a class during the day, without putting in a remark about Mobs or French Character or something about Paris fifty or a hundred years ago . . . In history class he seems to think the Commune is a sort of North Star and all other events revolve around it . . . He certainly has a hero named Oliphant or some name like that."

Ned wrote Mr. Graham at the end of the year. "Mother and I are going to spend the summer near Paris. I will remember you to the 'Rue de Sevres.'" The year after that the programme both at Stockwood and Santa Cruz diminished the correspondence; Mr. Graham was preparing for his ordination to the priesthood, Ned Thornton was a Senior at College and in line for honours at Commencement. However, early in that June, the Dean wrote to Mr. Graham, and sent the Senior year-book with his letter, saying, "I prefer to let you read for yourself a statement which the enclosed gives about your friend, Edward Thornton."

Mr. Graham flicked the pages rapidly, one by one, each with its picture and playful biography of the several Seniors. "Here's old Ned," he whispered, when he came to that page. Underneath Thornton's picture he read:

A dreamer lives forever,  
But a toiler dies in a day.

And then, after an enumeration of the class societies and activities in which Ned had figured during his four years at Santa Cruz, and some pleasantries about his idiosyncrasies, the page ended with the following sentences: "Ned has not been altogether a dreamer. His amiable and frequent allusions to a chapter in French history were not merely in jest. In addition to his class themes and exercises, he has done a noteworthy piece of extra work. Look among the pages of advertisements in this book for proof of this statement."

Mr. Graham eagerly sought the page, and there was a full-space advertisement, by a distinguished publishing house on Fifth Avenue, New York:

"The Life and Times of Pierre Olivaint, Jesuit. By Edward Thornton."

"And this has come," mused Mr. Graham smilingly, "from looking for material for a story!"

MICHAEL EARLS.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

ANNE CATHERINE EMMERICH.

A FRANCISCAN FATHER, who writes from Quaracchi, is very displeased with the article which appeared in the January number of this review on "the Authenticity of the Emmerich Visions." As we feel in no way able to tender the apology and retraction which he demands, the simplest course seems to be to print the text of the letter of protest which he has addressed to the Editor. Our critic can hardly complain if his comments are given the same measure of publicity which was enjoyed by the article complained of. The document runs as follows:

Collegio di S. Bonaventura,  
Quaracchi (Firenze).

February 15th, 1924.

Editor of "The Month," London.

Rev. Dear Sir,—

I could hardly believe my eyes when I beheld the Rev. Fr. Herbert Thurston wasting ten good pages of the January "Month" on the quixotic task of fighting windmills! I refer to the article "The Authenticity of the Emmerich Visions." Patiently I awaited the February number in the hope of finding there a much-needed recantation. Nothing of the kind!

Where has Fr. Thurston been keeping himself these last six months? Where has he been gathering his misinformation on A. K. Emmerich? (that is the correct spelling!) Doesn't he know anything of the monumental work of P. Winfried Hümpfner, O.E.S.A.—"Clemens Brentanos Glaubwuerdigkeit in seinen Emmerich-Aufzeichnungen," Wuerzburg, St. Rita Verlag, 1923? Is it news to him that the so-called Emmerich Visions are a scientific mystification,—in plain English: a literary hoax,—perpetrated by that victim of his own imagination: Clemens Brentano?

It is not my purpose,—as it certainly is not my duty,—to refute the ravings of the Rev. Fr. Thurston. The book referred to has been on the market since, at the latest, September last year (1923),—it has been reviewed by leading German publications, and even in the "Fortnightly Review" of St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A. Let Fr. Thurston explain his unpardonable unacquaintance with it.

What I protest against, is the flippant tone, the ill-concealed sneers heaped upon that innocent victim of Divine Love and vicarious suffering,—and, incidentally, of Brentano's morbid sensationalism—the Servant of God: Anne Catherine Emmerich. Even a "German" nun might expect gentlemanly treatment at the hands of an English Cleric.

The doings and sayings of people of "exaggerated self-concentra-



tion,"—of a "distinct tendency towards megalomania";—of persons "sensitive to the slightest suspicion of a slur"—"thoroughly conceited and filled with self-sufficiency" do not reach the stage of "Positio Monasteriensis Beatificationis et Canonizationis Servae Dei Annae Catharinae Emmerick."—Perhaps they write ill-advised articles for English periodicals; but their sanctity is not investigated in Rome. Holy Mother Church is entirely too careful for that.

Only with deepest indignation can one read the unmanly attacks of Fr. Thurston upon the character of this Saintly Virgin. If he has one spark of manhood and chivalry in him, he will tender an apology to the humble and childlike martyr of Duermen and the readers of the "Month" whom he has so inexcusably misled. I use the phrase quite deliberately, for Fr. Thurston has no excuse. He poses as an authority on his subject, and it therefore was and is his sacred duty to keep himself abreast of the results of the "Emmerick-Forschung." It did not take the book of Fr. Hümpfner to convince,—long ago—any *conscientious* student of the Emmerick problem, that her so-called revelations were the premeditated forgeries of Brentano and of nobody else. We may excuse the ignorance and scribendi cacoethes of an H. G. Wells, but we will not do anything of the kind in the case of such a distinguished authority de omni re scribili et quibusdam aliis as the Rev. Fr. Herbert Thurston.

Very respectfully yours,

Br. EDWIN J. ANWEILER,

O.F.M., Ph.D.

With regard to the tone of this epistle comment is surely unnecessary. Its language speaks for itself. But there are certain allegations made in the course of it which can hardly be suffered to pass without a word of reply. The fundamental grievance seems to be that we wrote about Sister Emmerich without having studied the recent work of Father Hümpfner, O.E.S.A. Now, on our critic's own showing, this essay only saw the light in Germany during September, 1923. The article complained of, inserted in our January number, was written in the middle of December. No notice of Hümpfner's book has even now appeared in such a periodical as the *Stimmen der Zeit*. Only in the issue for December-January it is named in the list of books received. In the "Literarischer Anzeiger" of the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* of Innsbruck the work has never been mentioned at all. Further, though Holland is in every respect nearer to Germany than this country is, an article in the Dutch Catholic periodical *Studiën, Tijdschrift voor Godsdienst, Wetenschap en Letteren*, contributed to the February number expressly to commemorate the centenary of Anne Catherine Emmerich (she died on February 9th, 1824), ignores Father Hümpfner's researches as completely as THE MONTH has done.

Secondly, the insinuation that the phrases "sensitive to the slightest suspicion of a slur" and "thoroughly conceited and

filled with self-sufficiency" were used of Anne Catherine herself is absolutely unfounded, as anyone may see who will refer to p. 49 of the article complained of. That Sister Emmerich was a mystic who served God with very great fervour, we have never doubted, but we believe her to have been deluded about her revelations, and for that reason we do not think it likely that she will ever be canonized. There are not a few souls whose history presents the same combination of extraordinary phenomena with a mistaken belief in a continuous stream of divine communications of which they consider themselves to be the privileged recipients. The case of Claire Ferchaud of Loublande is still fresh in the memory of all, and we hold that the same is true both of a stigmatisée now much talked about in Brussels and of the English mystic Teresa Higginson who died in this country a few years ago. We say nothing of such famous ecstasies of former times as Maria de Agreda, Marina de Escobar or Palma Matarrelli d'Oria. When the Church, after official inquiry, pronounces that Anne Catherine or anyone of those just mentioned is worthy of the veneration of the faithful, we shall at once, of course, most loyally accept that decision. But until then we are free to hold to our private opinion, an opinion which has been formed not without investigation and is based upon reasons which seem well-founded to others beside ourselves.

Lastly, although we must defer any final expression of our views until we have been able to procure a copy of Father Hümpfner's book, we find it difficult to believe that the utterances which for more than sixty years have been accepted unquestioningly as Anne Catherine's revelations by her own advocates, by Father Schmöger, her biographer and editor, and Father Wegener, the postulator of the cause of her canonization, are nothing but "*the premeditated forgeries* of Brentano and nobody else." This is to go a long way beyond the conclusion of Cardauns and Stahl. Is it in any way credible that a popular poet and littérateur, such as Brentano was, should have condemned himself to a five years' exile by an invalid's bedside in a dreary provincial townlet simply to perpetrate a vast imposture, to the elaboration of which he devoted all the remaining years of his life? The alleged visions eventually published by Schmöger from Brentano's manuscripts, which were written day after day at Dülmen and carefully dated, amount to more than a million words. What possible motive could the poet have for filling ream upon ream of paper with notes of what Sister Emmerich never said or dreamed of saying? Can we believe that when Brentano in these notes represents the visionary as struggling to recall some place-name in Palestine or Cyprus, spelling it letter by letter, or correcting it into a form which disagreed

with his own convictions, he was deliberately laying the foundations of an imposture which Father Schmöger helped to carry out? All this is quite inconsistent with the character of a man who, after all, is well known to us from his letters and from the biography of Diel-Kreiten (*Clemens Brentano, ein Lebensbild*). That Brentano when editing *Das bittere Leiden* supplied gaps in Anne Catherine's visions from Martin von Cochem, and other sources, is likely enough. It is also probable that Sister Emmerich's trance utterances reflected in large measure Brentano's own ideas.<sup>1</sup> Those who are familiar with the literature of psychic research will be able to recall many examples of this kind of thought transference. But that "the Pilgrim," sitting beside Anne Catherine at Dülmen, simply invented a long and complicated romance swarming with names of people and places, and then deliberately put into her mouth the fable which he himself had dreamed, we do not believe. Nothing could be stronger than the language used by Father Schmöger (who had Brentano's manuscripts and innumerable other Emmerich papers in his keeping for something more than twenty years) in declaring his conviction of Brentano's honesty and sincerity. Yet Father Schmöger was a highly respected Superior among the Redemptorists, an austere Order to which all the world pays tribute, and at the very time when he was engaged in these researches he was appointed Provincial. We do not share Father Schmöger's views as to the supernatural character of Anne Emmerich's revelations, but it is impossible to doubt his sincerity in the opinion he expressed with regard to both the "Pilgrim" and the visionary herself. Similarly the first postulator of the cause, Father Wegener, speaks with complete conviction of Brentano's honesty. The Pilgrim's whole purpose, he declares, was "nur wörtlich das zu schreiben was die Seherin gesagt hatte."<sup>2</sup> But now apparently Father Hümpfner comes along, and while enunciating the vitally important fact that all the editors and critics during the past 100 years have been wrong in writing the name Emmerich (it ought, he asserts, to be Emmerick),<sup>3</sup> he assures us that all the revelations, which alone have made the visionary's name familiar outside her own province of Westphalia, never

<sup>1</sup> In the book of J. C. F. Bährens, *Der animalische Magnetismus*, which was printed in 1816, two years before Brentano ever met Sister Emmerich, the author quotes from a private letter he had received from Anne Catherine's medical attendant, Dr. Druffel. The latter informs him that even in the convent she used occasionally to "let fall a little word about her visions and revelations." He also mentions that in her ecstasies she spoke out aloud the thoughts of other people near her if they were occupied in reading some pious matter silently to themselves. This exactly corresponds with what was suggested in our article of October, 1921, p. 351.

<sup>2</sup> See Wegener's essay, *Anna Katharina Emmerich und Clemens Brentano*, Dülmen, 1900, p. 125.

<sup>3</sup> Bährens in 1816 prints her name Emmerich, as it was spelt by Druffel, her doctor, and Rensing, her parish priest.

proceeded from her at all but were fraudulently invented by Brentano. We cannot, it must be confessed, help feeling that the motive at the back of this strange *volte-face*, as Dr. Preuss' (American) *Fortnightly Review* plainly suggests, is the realization "that the beatification process of Anne Catherine can never be brought to a successful termination if the utterances attributed to her by the poet, Clemens Brentano, are genuine." It was consequently necessary to discredit Brentano, and Father Hümppfner's book is the result. We can only say in conclusion that having a high appreciation of the scholarly work done at Quaracchi by the Fathers who edit the *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* and who are responsible for many other important contributions to historical studies, we regret very much to find ourselves in disagreement with any member of that community, but our judgment of the Emmerich problem is an honest one and we cannot modify it without better reason than any which has yet been brought to our notice.

H. T.

#### MALINES AND "CORPORATE REUNION."

LIKE the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Cardinal Archbishop of Malines has published a letter to explain the exact scope and effect of the three several "conversations," which took place during the last few years under his roof and presidency between certain Catholics and Anglicans. Like the Archbishop's letter, the Cardinal's also has been misunderstood by various commentators. *The Church Times* naturally does not like its assumption that it was the Anglicans who came for help to "Rome," and asserts, according to its brief, that "Rome" is in as parlous a state as Anglicanism. But the most startling misconception comes from a quarter whence one would least expect it. Lord Halifax's gloss upon the Cardinal's letter is that "it emphasises the duty of English Roman Catholics to consider how they can assist in bringing about the corporate reunion of the Church of England with the Holy See, rather than merely considering how best to secure individual conversions."<sup>1</sup> We have re-read the Cardinal's letter, but we can discover nothing, even between the lines, to justify such a comment. It is true that His Eminence, quoting some unnamed critics, writes, "We are told that we are going the wrong way to reach our goal . . . experience, it is alleged, has taught us [? you] not to consider groups: individual conversions only must be sought for." We do not know what Catholics have been so foolish as so to mislead His Eminence: certainly we have never met them here. Our whole religious object is to convert our fellow countrymen and women to the

<sup>1</sup> Letter to the *Church Times*, Feb. 22nd.

true faith: if they come in groups so much the better, granting that they have been adequately instructed: the more groups and the larger they are the more pleased we shall be. But even if some one *had* said that it was better to ply rod and line than use a net, in this matter of fishing for men, the meaning could only have been that, before reception and individual (if conditional) baptism, the applicants for admission into the Church must severally guarantee their understanding and acceptance of her claims. Mere prudence suggests that each "fish" must, to some extent, be dealt with individually. In any case Lord Halifax is not entitled to say that, by "groups" His Eminence meant "Churches," especially such a heterogeneous "Church" as the Anglican. The Cardinal would be the last man to countenance the heresy that the one Church is visibly divided and, though his assessor, the Abbé Portal, is still ill-advised enough to speak of the Anglican Church as "the daughter of Rome" and as actually "belonging to the Patriarchate of the West," the theologian who rules the Archdiocese of Malines could never use expressions so savouring of heresy. Last month we pointed out that "corporate reunion" is a false and misleading expression implying two errors, 1) that Anglicanism is in any true sense a Church, and 2) that it once was united with Rome. Perhaps the distinction will be clearer if we reflect that it is altogether correct to speak of the reunion of *England* with the Holy See, for the nation as a whole was once a faithful child of Rome but, all save a fragment, was robbed of its inheritance and turned out of the fold by a succession of sacrilegious despots. But to speak of reunion with *Anglicanism* is largely to ignore, and almost to condone, the sad work of these robbers.

All this is not to deny that the Holy Spirit is at work amongst those wandering sheep of the English race, who are not outside the Fold through their own fault. The whole history of the "Catholic Revival" proves the contrary. The gradual recovery, fragment by fragment, of Catholic truth, the groping for union and a centre of unity, the very pretensions to continuity with the old Church, the constant adoption of distinctively Catholic practices, all suggest the reward given to prayer and good faith by the Spirit of God. The declarations of the Lambeth Conference in 1920 and all the subsequent efforts after unity are, as such, in full accord with our Lord's design, and are pursued on a scale and with a vigour unthinkable thirty years ago. The remarkable phenomenon of so-called "Anglo-Catholicism," which, in the person of Lord Halifax, is willing to recognize a *de jure* Papal Supremacy and, in other quarters, has gone so far as to repudiate the Book of Common Prayer as wholly heretical, is a product of much more recent date, and who shall say where it will end? Catholics in England do not need encourage-

ment to take interest in all this movement. They are conceivably more interested, as they are certainly better informed, than Catholics abroad, and they may be trusted to look out for and to further by every means in their power the workings of the Spirit of Truth amongst the non-Catholics around them.

J.K.

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

### Government by the Labour Party.

Despite the fears of many like the old Oxford don, who wrote to *The Times* (January 15th) deprecating "the domination of work-people," Labour has been in office for over a month and the skies have not fallen. The "work-people" are acting very much like other people in their position, and are making just as good a show on the Government benches—answering or parrying questions, appointing committees, promising legislation, keeping steadily in the traditional Parliamentary grooves. Yet the situation, both at home and abroad, bristles with difficulties which they have inherited, and they themselves are hampered, not so much by the false economic theories associated with their organization but by the fact that they exist on sufferance, and hold office at the pleasure of their opponents. Their only security is the feeling that the country, annoyed by the unnecessary election in December, would annihilate any party that should cause another. And their obvious policy is to commit themselves only to measures which will meet the approval of the great majority of the electorate. After all, whatever be the number of votes they secured in the election, they do, as the Labour party, represent *de facto* all the workers of the kingdom. Thus they can understand and represent, better than others, the working-class view, and engage working-class sympathies. There is no worker that does not regard their acquisition of power and their conduct in high office with a certain amount of pride. To overthrow them wantonly would bring such a nemesis that no party will dare to attempt it yet.

### The Strike Portent.

The cartoon in *Punch* which represented the Premier's programme as a series of strike-disputes interspaced with attempts at normal legislation seems likely to be verified. Hardly was the railway-strike ended than the dockers' strike began and, with this on the eve of settlement, a miners' strike looms ahead. All these are concerned with what are called national services,—transport, travel, fuel—and thus they are in immediate effect assaults upon the welfare of the community, strikers and employers included. Hence the particular stupidity of this man-



ner of attempting to settle disputes, folly the more pronounced that in each industry<sup>1</sup> there are accessible Industrial Councils, representing both employees and employers and capable of determining what justice demands, and in default of an agreement, Courts of Inquiry can be set up by Government, under the Industrial Courts Act of 1919, with power to examine on oath and secure the production of all relevant documents. One would think that, considering what work-stoppages have cost the nation during the last few years, this method of argument would have been thoroughly discredited. The number of working-days lost by trade-disputes during the four years, 1920-1923 was approximately 142 millions, counting only the trades directly affected, not those put out of work indirectly. In every case, both sides lost incomparably more than yielding the issue in dispute would have cost them, and the community suffered in proportion. For whatever the result, whether wages are increased or profits safeguarded, it is always the ultimate consumer that pays, and all are consumers. Surely, in a civilized State, process of law should determine whether contracts, freely entered upon, have been voided or should be enforced. The community has provided the tribunals; why are they not used and why, pending their decision, should not work go on without prejudice? If private individuals undertake to perform public services, and to make their profit in so doing, they have a right to secure their own interests, but they should not be free to neglect these services whenever their interests seem to be threatened. Otherwise the plea for "nationalization" or the suppression of private interest in the provision of public services becomes reasonable and urgent. Even if, after arbitration, the parties were not obliged to accept the judicial award, still the public ventilation of their respective cases would show the public where justice lay, and it is on public opinion in the long run that the duration of the strike or lock-out depends.

**The Dockers' Claims.**

In spite of the prejudice under which they justly laboured because of their unauthorized six-weeks' strike of last summer, public opinion is generally in favour of the dockers in the present case. The denunciation of the prevailing conditions of work at the docks, contained in the Shaw report of 1920, which have not been improved in the interval, makes their plea for a two-shilling rise in pay to correspond to the rise in the cost of living seem not unreasonable, especially as the owners' dividends showed no signs of falling. Moreover, no Christian can view with equanimity the existence of a "pool" of unemployment awaiting a sudden and precarious call for extra

<sup>1</sup> Except indeed, so far, in the mining, cotton, engineering and ship-building industries.

hands. So the men's plea for maintenance or, in other words, for a "guaranteed week" meets with a certain sympathy. The full statement of the position on both sides, which was begun in the Court of Inquiry set up by the Labour Minister, promised to be of much interest, and we should regret the adjournment of the Court, had it not been caused by renewed negotiations between owners and men which promise a satisfactory issue. Meanwhile, the strike has lasted a week, causing great loss to the country through the diversion of trade from our ports, the non-fulfilling of orders, the stoppage of other work, and of mails, etc. It is said that the utmost expenditure that the companies would have to face, if all the men involved worked full time at the enhanced pay, would be about two million pounds a year. They may have lost much more than that in the few days of the strike, without vindicating any principle that was worth the sacrifice. Whatever may have been the case last July, this time the dockers have not struck wantonly. We may hope that this much good may come out of the evil—that the Government, as well as the parties concerned, will make timely provision against the possibility of a disastrous coal-strike five weeks hence.

**The Government  
not  
Socialist.**

Attempts are being made in certain quarters to label this Government Socialist. This we think a mistaken effort, even were the label really accurate and descriptive. It would give an immense impetus to Socialism of the Continental type to be able to point to Great Britain, hitherto noted for its steady constitutionalism and regard for precedent, as having fallen under Socialist rule. There are Socialists, of course, in the Government, perhaps the majority of its members would claim the title, but there are few, if any, Communists or Marxians, few that could be rightly arraigned of real anti-civic injustice. In a remarkable "Open Letter to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald," a writer in the March *Christian Democrat* conclusively shows that the Prime Minister is no more a Socialist than Disraeli was, although he belongs to associations which profess that economic creed. Mr. Snowden's Socialism we ourselves appraised, following the lead of the late Archbishop of Liverpool, and found almost tolerable, over ten years ago,<sup>1</sup> and it has become even milder since. Mr. Webb is a Fabian of the old school, content to wait until, in due course of evolution, Socialism is seen to be the best form of life in community. Mr. J. H. Thomas has publicly disclaimed the name of Socialist. Finally, the Labour party as an organism has consistently resisted all attempts to graft Communism upon its constitution. So rather than try to discredit beforehand by an opprobrious label all that the Labour Government does or projects, it seems better policy to take its measures

<sup>1</sup> "Socialism according to Mr. Snowden." THE MONTH, August, 1913.

on their own merits and give their authors credit for a wish to benefit the country.

**Leo XIII.  
and  
Labour Policy.**

After all the general policy of Labour, apart from its methods, is to better the condition of the workers, to see that the weak are not exploited by the strong, to complete their emancipation from the inhuman conditions into which a Godless commercialism had originally plunged them. Their aim could hardly be better expressed than in the words of Pope Leo XIII:<sup>1</sup>

Justice demands that the interests of the poorer classes should be carefully watched over by the administration, so that they who contribute so largely to the advantage of the community may themselves share in the benefits they create,—that, being housed, clothed and enabled to sustain life, they may find their existence less hard and more endurable . . . for it cannot but be good for the commonwealth to shield from misery those on whom it so largely depends.

And later in the same great Encyclical:—

Those who are badly off have no resources of their own to fall back upon, and must chiefly depend upon the assistance of the State. And it is for this reason that wage-earners, who are undoubtedly among the weak and necessitous, should be specially cared for and protected by the Government.

Hence, according to the Pope, the fact that the whole structure of the State rests upon the lowly, patient, unremitting labour of the workers, is a reason for their receiving preferential treatment from those in power. "That society should be so organized that contributions should be according to capacity, and the distribution of the common good should be according to need: a man owing more, the stronger he is, and receiving more, the weaker he is: the issue being the prevailing advantage of the lower classes" is, according to Devas,<sup>2</sup> "simply the social theory of the Christian Church, such as we can read in the Christian literature of the earliest ages or, in these latest times, in the Encyclicals of Leo XIII."

**Wages first,  
then  
Fair Profits.**

All the more reason, of course, that these righteous aims should be pursued by righteous means. There will be no keener critics of the legislation and administration of the new Government than those who, following Papal guidance, are striving for the Christianization of commerce and industry. Man

<sup>1</sup> *Condition of the Working Classes*, C.T.S. edit., pp. 33, 35.

<sup>2</sup> *Political Economy* (1901), pp. 515—16.

has been put on earth to work, and it is a Christian principle that the subsistence of the worker should be the first charge on the product, whenever he has no other source of livelihood. Profits come next and may not be sought beyond a certain moral limit. What the just limit of profits is can be determined in the same way as the just price is determined—by the common sense of the community, which demands a reasonable proportion between price and value. To exceed this reasonable profit is an injustice to the worker or the consumer or to both. It is the crime of usury. All that Labour can do to suppress this crime must needs have our sympathy and assistance. And it will need both, for the practice of immoral money-making is deeply rooted in our commercial system. Unemployment is tolerated as a condition for the supply of cheap labour. There is no widespread recognition of the human rights and dignity of the worker, there is no legal enforcement of a living wage, still less of a family wage. Yet elsewhere, in France, Belgium and Germany, it has been found possible, without serious diminution of profits, to provide from a "compensation pool," levied from the industry, a wage which increases as the worker's family grows,<sup>1</sup> a system which, amongst other advantages, does not discourage marriage or the rearing of children, and which settles a whole host of difficulties arising from a flat-rate. The scheme has been urged in England by Miss Eleanor Rathbone,<sup>2</sup> and a "Family Endowment Council" has been founded to promote it here.<sup>3</sup> We trust that the Labour Government will encourage its adoption.

**Inexperience  
in  
Office.**

If the Minister of Health had issued his explanation of his rescission of the Poplar "Relief Regulation Order, 1922," simultaneously with the rescission itself, he might have saved himself and the Government much uninformed criticism. His action has still to be debated, but it is plain that he had no wish to aid and abet lawlessness in Poplar. His precipitate decision was the result of inexperience, and has had, at any rate, the effect of focussing attention upon the chaotic state of the London Poor-law. Another inexperienced Minister, the under-Secretary for Air, actually made the mistake of advocating "moral disarmament" in the House of Commons, even whilst he announced that the policy of the late Government in regard to increasing the Air Force would be carried on "for the time being." It was this daring hint that that policy might later

<sup>1</sup> See a description of the "Allocations familiales" in "Christianity and Civics in France," by C. Tigar, S.J., *THE MONTH*, Oct. 1923, and in *The Christian Democrat* for March, 1923 ("The Family Bonus System in France," by I. Hernaman), as also for June, August, September and October, 1921.

<sup>2</sup> Letter to *The Times*, Feb. 5th.

<sup>3</sup> Hon. Sec. Miss O. Vlasto, Bonnevaire, Sefton Park, Liverpool.

on become unnecessary because of "a change in the international atmosphere" that drew down upon the rash idealist the fierce criticism of the "para bellum" type. Mr. Leach is a Tolstoyan pacifist, as wrong in that extreme as the militarist is in his, but he said no more than the bulk of the nation expects when he pledged the Government to favour international disarmament, and ridiculed the idea of war being averted by competition in armaments. Surely he was right in saying that in the present state of the "international atmosphere," charged as it is with the evil fumes of fear, mistrust, covetousness, pride and hatred, no *adequate* defence is possible for any nation. None of the Great Powers will ever allow any of the others to become so permanently and preponderantly strong as to be altogether secure from attack, for the simple reason that that supreme strength can be used for offence as well as defence. Unless there is international agreement to limit armaments or a changed "international atmosphere," there must be competition, insecurity, and ultimately war.

**Why compete  
with  
France?**

Those who urged the increase of the Air Force did so explicitly on the ground that France is over-strong in that arm. She has 1,000 first-line aeroplanes: we, at the most, 100. Yet equally explicit was the declaration that, of course, no danger was to be apprehended from France. "No one in this country," said *The Times* magisterially (February 20th), "supposes for a moment that hostilities can arise between such old and tried allies and friends as France and England." That would seem a good reason for saving on the Air Force, but no. "This country . . . must have a Home Defence Air Force capable of defending these shores even from the most unlikely attacks," an argument more bluntly expressed two days later by a correspondent, who wrote: "An Englishman does not care to exist on the forbearance of even a friendly neighbour,"—forgetting that he himself, meeting a thousand people every day, one of whom *might* kill him, actually does live, and comfortably enough, on their forbearance. The illusion that strength necessarily gives security results from ignoring the existence of other nations seeking security in the same way, yet it seems impossible to dispel it. France has obviously strengthened her Air Force as an effective and relatively cheap way of maintaining military pressure upon Germany, and, as long as that need is supposed to exist, she will go on developing that arm. It is only incidentally that it can be taken as a menace to England, and it would be much simpler and cheaper to make an alliance with her under the League of Nations than to arm against her.

**Relative  
Expenditure on  
Armaments.**

Yet England is spending on armaments more than twice as much as France: more than five times, if we take the Navy alone. Our whole Defence Expenditure for the current financial year is sixty million pounds more than that of ten years ago, the year before the war! Yet Germany as a reason for defence has disappeared, for a generation at least. Japan, by the act of God, has suffered the enormous loss of 800 million pounds, and has had *volens volens* to cut down her naval expenditure. We have to pay America thirty millions a year for the next sixty years, which puts any attempt at naval competition with her out of the question. Neither France nor Italy have aimed at a strong Navy. To the ordinary citizen paying taxes, it may well seem that he is at the moment "over-insured," that the financial strength accruing from economy in defence might more than compensate for the lessening of our naval preponderance, which is greater at the moment than ever before, the British Navy being stronger, even without further building, than all the fleets of Europe together. In the circumstances, then, it was probably the weakness of their position rather than a reasoned conviction of naval requirements that prompted the Labour Government, in desperate need of finding funds for their various projects of reform, to go on with the naval plans of their predecessors. Unable to show any real urgency in the matter, they fell back on the plea of providing employment, which was that of Mr. Baldwin in anticipating this particular work of replacing obsolete cruisers. It is a poor plea, a plea which any militarist might use to justify any increase of armament. The Naval Sub-Commission of the League of Nations, now sitting at Rome to consider how the provisions of the Washington Treaty can be extended to the whole world, will not be helped by the Government's decision.

**The persistence  
of the  
War-Mind.**

The speaker who forced the hand of the Government on the Air issue spoke of "a mobilization of public opinion in the various countries of Europe" as "the most efficacious of all methods" to bring about a general reduction of armaments. But as long as the press generally is not converted from the old and false notions, and preaches, in season and out of season, through mere intellectual inertia, the necessity of armaments to promote peace, how can the press-ridden peoples assert their detestation of war. Catholics, at any rate, should beware of false thinking in this matter.

The Catholic Church [said the Archbishop of Liverpool the other day] stands for peace. We are sick and tired of war of all sorts. We are sick and tired of the massacre



which went on for so many years and which has left the world infinitely sadder and poorer, and not one single whit the better. War itself is played out. It should not be possible except in some cases of extraordinary necessity—if civilization, for instance, were to be overrun by barbarian hordes from somewhere. The time is coming when reason must reign.

The spectacle of the Continent—France's strangle-hold on Germany, Italy's imperialistic nationalism, the fierce little mid-European States, educating all their manhood for war and, bankrupt as they are, pledging their financial future to obtain more and more arms—shows there is little hope for the return of reason save in a return to the faith. The League of Nations has done much and will do more: it merits our support as our only human hope against another and final catastrophe: but the League of Nations without the blessing and the moral prestige of the Papacy will always remain inadequate. However, if Catholics only understand and live up to the implications of their faith, militarism will become less powerful, and charity as well as justice between nations grow in proportion.

**Mercy  
twice Blessed.**

European peace cannot even be conceived except as the result of real friendship between the two chief European nations, France and Germany. The progress of commerce, of the arts, of religion itself the world over, all waits upon their reconciliation. Are we any nearer to it? Everything depends upon how the decisions of the two expert Committees set up by the Reparation Commission—the one to enquire into the supposed "flight" of German capital, the other to see how the German budget can be balanced—are received by the two nations most concerned. If agreement is reached with an honest desire to end a disastrous quarrel and some measure of consideration for each other's point of view, then at last we can begin to recover. Meanwhile, the social condition of Germany at present is enough to move the pity of the greatest stickler for justice. What *The Times* foresaw last November—"The immediate prospect in Germany is widespread starvation of those who are least of all responsible for the disasters which have befallen Europe"—had even then come to pass, over large areas. Cardinal Bourne in January issued a strong and persistent appeal through press and pulpit to the Archdiocese to come to the aid of the British sphere of occupation, plunged into destitution by the Ruhr invasion, an appeal which we understand has met with a generous response. And many non-Catholic Relief Societies are, in the most Christian spirit, collecting money, food, medical stores and clothing here in England for our late enemies, and their depen-

dants and descendants. The united Catholic charities of Germany, the "Caritasverband," representing about 3,000 local units all over the Fatherland, has calculated that one German in ten is at the moment in actual need of help. The Pope has sent 1,000,000 lire to this body, and has blessed the mission it has sent to America to collect funds. We doubt not that even in France the call of Christian charity would be heard, and a response made, worthy of the Catholicity of that great nation, if an appeal were made to the faithful. No better preparation could be imagined for a new and lasting friendship than such an act of grace. There is doubtless immense wealth in Germany actual and potential: we are in full sympathy with every honest effort to make her millionaires disgorge the money they have gained out of their country's misfortunes and to apply it to the payment of her debts, but such desires need not interfere with the free exercise of charity on behalf of the unfortunate. Much is gained once we learn to envisage Germany not as a hostile unit, which has done us harm and is evading the penalty, but a vast complex of good and bad, dominated in the past by an ambitious militarism, and now perhaps by a group of shifty financiers, and on the whole to be pitied rather than blamed.

**Be at peace  
with thine  
Adversary.**

What those anxious for permanent peace are asking is—can a policy which aims at the indefinite suppression of Germany ever succeed? Clearly not. If dismemberment were feasible, it would have happened long ago, when the first shock of defeat was felt and before renewed aggression had made the German peoples realize that their survival was bound up in their union. If, then, Germany is certain to be great and powerful once more, and in a position to make her resentment felt, is it wise to sow the seeds of future trouble by pursuing present advantage to the utmost? That this is a question of the greatest moment is made clear by an article in the current number of our able contemporary, *Etudes*, entitled "La 'Grande Pitié' de la Nation française," an article which will be read with much concern by all friends of France, for its effect is to show that owing to sterility in marriage that great nation is slowly dying. It is no new subject, as even our own pages can show. Many Congresses have been held to discuss it: many associations have been formed to combat the evil. The French Government, acutely uneasy about the persistence of the phenomenon, has published a map, showing in black the departments in which the yearly deaths exceed the yearly births. This map is almost entirely black, a few departments only, in Brittany and the South, showing white. Those are the departments where, as is known from other sources, the Catholic faith is best practised. The writer of the article

implies throughout that the sterility is artificial: the remedies he calls for are moral, a reawakening of conscience, a fight against selfishness. The result, which alarms a Government not over-keen about Christian morality, is that the population of France is practically stationary whilst that of Germany has a net annual increase of about 700,000. The *Etudes* figures show that, whereas between 1875 and 1913 the French population increased by about 2,800,000, that of Germany in the same interval increased by 23,400,000! In neither case does the shift of numbers owing to the loss and gain of Alsace-Lorraine affect the increase. The last computation (1921) gives France 39,000,000, and Germany 63,000,000 inhabitants. The *Etudes* writer quotes from "L'Alliance Nationale pour l'accroissement de la population française" the melancholy prevision that this year, the same causes still operating, France will lose 200,000 inhabitants, and by 1940 the annual loss will be 250,000, and he is at pains to point out the military significance of all this. To us it strongly emphasizes the unwisdom of sacrificing the future to the present.

**"The Fruits  
of  
Philosophy."**

The purblind leaders of the contraceptive campaign in this country, who profess such pure humanitarian aims but teach the doctrine of devils, would have us admire what all France, believers and non-believers alike (save for a few Neo-Malthusians), views with disgust and apprehension, and endeavours to counteract—the self-indulgence which triumphs over morality and patriotism, and leads, not as they think to the comfort and security of the few and fit, but to certain national decay. Ancient Greece, and Ancient Rome in its wake, came to grief through neglect and misuse of marriage: the same fate, as inexorable as the moral law itself, awaits that nation which treads the same path. But patriotism, the future welfare of others, has a poor chance with the selfish heart seeking indulgence here and now. A stronger motive and a clearer guidance than given by a mere natural appeal are necessary to control the strongest of our natural passions, and those are to be found in the Catholic Church alone. The way of duty which she points out is sometimes hard, but her sacraments provide abundant strength to follow it. Catholics have need to be alert to prevent the various humanitarian institutions, which are aiming at relieving the effects of poverty instead of tackling its causes, from being exploited by eugenist and such-like faddists. We are told<sup>1</sup> that in various "Women's Institutes," founded to give economic instruction to villagers, moral lectures are being given, making them at once sectarian and objectionable to Catholics: more-

<sup>1</sup> See *Catholic Times*, Feb. 23rd, p. 14.

over, the different Welfare Centres, some of them helped by the rate-payer, are apt to be used for the teaching of the abominations of Birth-Control to poor and defenceless women. That at any rate would be a misuse of public institutions against which we have a right and a duty to protest.

**A Great President.**

The death of Mr. Woodrow Wilson on February 3rd removes one of the historic figures of the Great War, a man who held and used autocratic power more absolutely than the Kaiser, and very much more wisely, yet failed by forgetting the conditions of its tenure. He was made and he was broken by the American people. During the war he was the oracle of democracy, voicing its ideals with immense force and perspicacity, and finally succeeding, at the cost of much besides, in constituting what he hoped would be the final destruction of war and world-anarchy, the League of Nations. It was the irony of fate that his chief exploit was the cause of his undoing—not the conception in itself but the manner of its expression and enforcement. He might have led his people to accept it, but he tried to drive them, and he failed. It is too soon to say when precisely he mistook his rôle, and went astray. His breach of precedent in leaving the country during his term of office, though it raised American prestige abroad to an unexampled height, is said to have weakened his position at home. He might have done more if he had acted through others; he had not the art of using subordinates and building up a following: like Antæus, raised from earth, he lost power when he lost touch with his people. Yet Americans should be proud of him, for he was not ashamed, in a world of lesser men, to be an idealist and to aim at lofty things. We may well believe that, if he had had all his will, the world would now be far more peaceful and happy than it is.

**The Society of Jesus in Missouri.**

The growth of the Catholic Church in the United States is seen in epitome in the centenary record of the Missouri Province of the Society. It was in 1823 that twelve Jesuits came from Maryland to Missouri, missionary Fathers, amongst them the great De Smet, intent on nothing more than missionary labours amongst the natives. The foundation of the Province came much later, but these pioneer twelve are now represented by twelve hundred of the Society, who in their colleges and universities have charge of 20,000 students, conduct parishes and parish schools, support the missionary activities of British Honduras and of Patna, British India, whilst they still minister to the Sioux and other aborigines. Some account of the Centenary celebrations of last year is contained in a journal of St. Louis University, the *Fleur de Lis*, which also prints a remarkable

poem by Father James Daly, S.J., "Vexilla Regis," in which, in verse of high conception and musical charm, he pictures a sort of review on All Saints of the heavenly troops by their Great Captain, giving to the Society triumphant its place in the ranks, and not forgetting those who lived laborious and hidden days in the evangelization of Missouri.

#### A New Zealand "Month."

The Antipodes take credit for possessing all the best social and political institutions that flourish in the mother-country, and so we are not surprised to learn that New Zealand has a *Month* of its own, a journal edited by his Lordship the Bishop of Auckland and combining in its forty large folio pages all that makes a paper interesting and instructive to the Catholic—short pithy articles arranged for ready consumption (one by Father C. C. Martindale—*quæ regio in terris?*), news items local and universal, instructions, stories, "home" and "children's" sections, illustrations, and, in this first (January) issue of a new development, a highly commendatory letter from the Holy Father. The subscription rate is 6d. a copy, or 5s. per annum, post free. We wish Bishop Cleary all success in his conduct of our namesake: he is a veteran journalist, a stalwart champion of the Faith, and his vigorous exposure of a bitter anti-Catholic influence in his volume, *The Orange Society*, is still highly valued amongst us.

### III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

#### CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

**Authority in Religion** [W. Parsons, S.J., in *America*, Feb. 2, 1924, p. 369].

**Genesis I.**, How to understand [J. Simon, O.S.M., in *Homiletic Review*, Feb., 1924, p. 464].

**St. Paul's Reprehension of St. Peter** V. M'Nabb, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, Feb., 1924, p. 1406].

**Trinity**, Evolution of Doctrine [Dom J. Chapman in *Downside Review*, June, 1923, p. 101].

#### CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

**"Corporate Reunion"** a fallacy [J. Keating, S.J., in *Month*, March 1924, p. 260.].

**Wells, H. G.**, sized up [J. M. Gillis, C.S.P., in *Catholic World*, Feb., 1924, p. 645].

#### POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

**Anne Catherine Emmerich** and her biographers [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Month*, March, 1924, p. 256].

**Catholic Books**, One Hundred "Best" [F. X. Talbot, S.J., in *America*, Feb. 2, 1924, p. 380].

**Catholic Population of England** H. Thurston, S.J., in *Month*, March, 1924, p. 237].

**Cistercians**, Their Work in old England [N. Doyle, S.J., in *Month*, March, 1924, p. 200].

# REVIEWS

## I—THE ROMANS IN BRITAIN <sup>1</sup>

THIS work is popular in scope. A course of public lectures given in the University of Toronto forms its basis. The author's idea was, we gather, to present a picture of life in Roman Britain to an audience, many of whom might have no acquaintance with the topography and the historic sites of these islands. He has been most happily successful in this aim and many an educated reader in the Mother-country, too, will have reason to thank him for this volume. For, if the truth were known, even classical scholars are often woefully ignorant of that part of Roman history which is more especially connected with their own country; while, as for archæology, many quite genuine students of history have no great stomach for it. Sir Bertram Windle claims no expert knowledge in either of these branches. We should say that, if not an expert—and his professional work, of course, has lain in very different fields—he must at least be considered as a formidable amateur in archæological research. He has read widely, very little of the literature of his subject has escaped him; he has handled and studied the relics he describes; he has made expeditions in search of first-hand impressions. In a word, archæology has evidently been one of the predominant holiday-interests of his life, and like the active-minded man and born teacher that he is, he has given of his best to his hobby.

Coming to details, we think the most successful chapters in the book are the descriptions of the great Roman roads, in which the author's topographical gift is conspicuously displayed. "A visitor to the White Horse, near Uffington Lisle, on the Berkshire Downs, who pursues his investigations beyond that object and in the direction of Weyland Smith's forge, will come upon a green trackway with a low bank along either side, known there and elsewhere in its course as the Green Road." This is the ancient Icknield Street, a pre-Roman road, running across country from Norfolk to Wiltshire, and the author takes us along it from end to end, recalling its historical memories, its battle-sites, its fortresses, its camps, its vanished towns. Most of the sites are described from personal memory; and when we consider that similar accounts are given of all the ancient roads, our respect for the author's learning and industry is increased.

<sup>1</sup> By Bertram C. A. Windle. With 65 Illustrations. London: Methuen & Co. Pp. 235. 1923.



There are chapters also on Roman Religion, based on Cumont and Dill: and an interesting chapter on the administration of Britain as a Roman Province. With the late Professor Haverfield he believes that the people were very thoroughly Romanized, especially in the South and among the wealthier classes. The peasantry were naturally less completely transformed. Among them, "while the crust was Roman, the crumb was definitely Keltic." And this Keltic crumb, he reminds us, was by no means completely destroyed or driven out even by the Teutonic invaders of the sixth century.

The chapter on Christianity in Roman Britain is surprisingly short. Perhaps in a future edition the author will see his way to enlarging it. There are certain omissions. In narrating the arrival of Christianity in Britain, the legend of St. Joseph of Arimathea is given, and likewise the supposed missionary visits of St. Peter, St. Paul and St. Simon Zelotes, but no mention is made of the equally legendary episode of King Lucius and Pope Eleutherius.

The book is well got up. A word of special praise is due for the numerous excellent illustrations and maps.

## 2—COSMOLOGIES<sup>1</sup>

THE first work, written mainly in Latin, but breaking away from time to time into French, embraces both an exposition of the traditional teaching of the Schools and an attempt to harmonize it with the theories of modern science. Though the order and method is Scholastic, P. Dario never loses sight of what modern science has to say about the various subjects with which he deals. Thus he discusses modern theories of number and of mathematical infinite, Cantor's definition of a continuum, non-euclidean geometries, thermodynamics and energetics, radioactivity, and modern theories as to the structure of the atom. One could wish, perhaps, that he had also discussed the Quantum-theory, which seems to have important bearing on the nature of a physical continuum; and again that he had discussed the bearing of the new Relativity theory upon his thesis that "Euclidean Geometry is objectively and necessarily true."

The author argues that, while non-euclidean geometries are

<sup>1</sup> (1) *Praelectiones Cosmologiae* quas primum Gemerti, deinde Vallibus Anicii habebat J. M. Dario, S.J. Paris: Beauchesne. Pp. xii. 462. Price, 26.40 fr. 1923.

(2) *Cosmology*—Vol. I., *The Greeks and the Aristotelian Schoolmen*. By the Rev. John O'Neill, D.Ph., Professor of Special Metaphysics, Maynooth. London: Longmans. Pp. xi. 308. Price, 12s. 6d. net.

logically coherent, they ought not to be called geometries, since, unlike the geometry of Euclid, they are "purely logical deductions," and treat of "fictitious" instead of objective entities. But euclidean geometry also is, for modern geometricians, a "purely logical deduction" from a certain group of definitions, and, in view of the verification which experience has given to the non-euclidean geometry of Einstein, it may at any rate be questioned whether its definitions, which certainly claim to be of "objective entities," are not nearer the truth. In any case the author's argument hardly seemed to warrant the conclusion which he draws from it.

The essential doctrine of Aristotelico-scholasticism—that of matter and form—P. Dario discusses only in the last few pages of his book, though in the *Physics* of Aristotle it occupies the first place. The proof the author offers of its validity seems, moreover, to have little bearing on what has preceded, and we doubt if, relegated as it is almost to an appendix, it will appear to the reader very convincing. The concluding theses that Hylo-morphism is only "*adhuc praeferendus*" with respect to Hylozoism, Panpsychism and the modern type of Monism, also seem to us a little surprising. Though the author shows both originality and courage in tackling the immense problems which modern science presents to the philosopher, his conclusions are tentative, so that we cannot yet congratulate him on having found the way to that synthesis of science and scholastic philosophy which Duhem was looking for.

Of the contents of the second work the reader will be able to form some idea if he will try to imagine a hard-working and painstaking professor patiently collecting the material for a great book. Dr. O'Neill has read widely on the subject of Cosmology, both amongst the Greeks, amongst Scholastics, and amongst moderns, and everywhere where he has read he has taken copious notes. These notes he has now arranged under numerous and well-chosen headings, and has given them to the world.

Though with the exception of the Introduction and the concluding chapter it is exclusively of Greek Philosophy and of Mediaeval Scholasticism that Dr. O'Neill treats, the amount of material which he has collected, collated and arranged is simply prodigious. If the reader desires to know what *used to be said* by Scholastics, by Aristotle or Plato, or by pre-Aristotelian naturalists, he will find it carefully and accurately set forth in the book before us, and to a large extent in the phrases actually used by the writers whose views are cited.

The value of such a work to anyone desirous of writing a Cosmology can hardly be over-estimated. No conclusion is indeed reached, or even indicated, in the present work, for it is

in a second volume that the author proposes to "prove that the resumption, since the Leonine revival, of the older traditions of Aristotelian Scholasticism has resulted in a Scholastic Cosmology which is more in accordance with the assured results of modern science and modern philosophy than any of its contemporary rivals" (Preface). But, while waiting for the second volume which is to demonstrate how this synthesis may be accomplished, we congratulate the author most sincerely on the encyclopædic foundation which he has laid in the volume which Messrs. Longmans have just published. We know now at any rate what *was* taught, and it may be questioned whether there is any other book which presents the cosmological sayings of ancient and mediæval philosophers with the same completeness.

A special word of mention is called for by the Introduction, which comprises some forty-five pages, and makes most interesting reading. The earlier part is practically a history of the evolution of Greek thought, based mainly on Burnet and Father Joseph Rickaby, from both of whom long extracts are cited. The rest comprises a pertinent and witty satire on the ignorance of many physicists about all else save physics, an ignorance of which they seem often quite unaware.

There are small points that might be criticized in Dr. O'Neill's own work. For instance, he seems wrongly to think that Einstein has given up belief in the *Æther*; and we regret that in his thesis "Transient Causality a Making, not a Migration of Realities," he overlooked the Scholastic doctrine that Causality involves always an "*influxus rei in rem*."

There is one serious fault in the making of the book, the more serious in that it is so encyclopædic, though we know not whether the fault be due to the author or the publisher. The book contains innumerable quotations, sometimes a whole string of them following one after the other. Yet in such cases only *one* reference mark is given. If we desire to know what it means we have to turn to the notes at the end of the book, and having found the right chapter and the right reference mark, shall then discover the corresponding references. It is, however, impossible to discover *which* reference belongs to *which* quotation, unless we *count* both the quotations and then the references. Doubtless one would become skilled at this complicated and annoying task with proper practice, but we would earnestly beg the author, in the event of a second edition, to save his readers this trouble. It took the present writer twenty minutes to look up *one* reference to St. Thomas, and he twice got the wrong passage before hitting at last on the right one.

L.J.W.

3—PILGRIM PATHS IN LATIN LANDS<sup>1</sup>

ONCE again Dom Bede Camm, the author of that sumptuously illustrated book, *Forgotten Shrines*, has produced a volume worthy to rank with the former in interest, and surpassing it in excellence and variety of adornment. His subject is now shrines that are well-known, and though he has so many places to visit, he is clearly right to begin his pilgrimage at the *Sacro Speco* of Subiaco, where St. Benedict first devoted himself to the life of a coenobite. This is in many ways a most bewitching spot. The walls are covered with ancient paintings, and sometimes encrusted with primitive shrine-work. Now the grotto winds upwards, now it ascends by flights of marble steps, now it opens out into chapels, now again it descends to yet lower caves, the homes of ancient solitaries.

When, at last, he leaves Subiaco, Dom Bede journeys to Montecassino, the second and almost equally ancient and revered home of the Order. He goes fully into the disputed questions which centre around that great sanctuary, as about the Holy Places of Jerusalem, and laments, as we ourselves do, the influence of the school of Beuron in the adornment of the restored crypt.

We cannot follow Dom Bede throughout the whole of his pilgrimage, which is by no means confined to Benedictine shrines. We are glad to have an account of the wonderful modern foundation of Maredsous, which has already made its mark in the realms of art and literature. We are introduced to persons as well as to places; the chapter, for instance, headed "Ronciglione" gives a long and highly interesting account of a young English convert who became a Carmelite there, Miss Hartwell, in religion Sister Teresa Gonzaga. And towards the end of the book Dom Bede gives an account of his experiences in Jerusalem and Bethlehem towards the close of the war—"Latin Lands" in the sense that they once belonged to a Latin Kingdom.

Dom Bede has been fortunate in securing Mr. Joseph Pike, whose sketches added so much to the beauty of *Forgotten Shrines*, to employ his skilled pencil in the adornment of this book also, to which he contributes some score of exquisite drawings excellently reproduced.

<sup>1</sup> By Dom Bede Camm, O.S.B. London: Macdonald and Evans. Pp. 278. 66 photogravures and engravings. Price, 30s. net. 1923.

4—CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

THE Abbé L. Grimal, who has already presented in popular form the great theological treatise of the Incarnation of God the Redeemer, has now turned his attention to man the redeemed, and, in two volumes clearly and logically arranged, discusses the origin, present state and destiny of the human race, and thus comprises what is dealt with in theology under the categories of Creation, Grace and Eschatology. For the author, the chief part of man is his soul, and he relies for knowledge of the existence, equipment and fate of the soul mainly on revelation. One, therefore, must not look in these lucid pages for anthropology: it is with man as his Creator planned him that the Abbé deals. Of course, he cannot but touch upon the corporal element in the human composition and investigate the many puzzling questions of the antiquity of man, and the methods of reconciling revelation with the data of science. He will have nothing to do with the animal origin of man's body, holding rightly enough that direct creation gives a sounder and simpler explanation of the facts than any transformist theory. But this part of his treatise is relatively slight, about a fifth of the whole, and the student who wishes to understand and refute what is unsound in modern Darwinism will not find the author adequate. The process whereby the civilization of Adam's immediate descendants was lost, and the race became as degenerate as the first glimpses of prehistoric man show it to have been, is not even suggested. However, when he embarks upon man's present state, the condition of redeemed nature, the Abbé has no need to refer to or refute atheistic science, and the reader will find a very interesting and intelligible account of the nature and operations of grace, and a very well-balanced judgment on the great controversies which have marked its theological development. Dealing with the vexed questions of eschatology the author shows himself equally prudent, and has aptly interpreted the mind of the Church to-day in his insistence on the mercy of God and the mystery of His providence.

Because his main interest is the soul of man, the Abbé claims that his work is a psychological treatise, and because for information about that soul he goes to revelation, he calls it theological psychology. The result at any rate is fresh and able discussion of a vastly important subject.

<sup>1</sup> *L'Homme: son origine, sa condition présente, sa vie future.* By L. Grimal, D.D. Paris: La Bonne Press. 2 Vols. Pp. 508, 448. Price, 20 fr.

5—ANCIENT IRELAND<sup>1</sup>

THE late Dr. Sophie Bryant has given us a substantial and yet popular exposition of the Brehon Laws—their history and evolution, their underlying principles, the legends which have accumulated round them, and the effects they produced on the Irish character during a vogue of well over a thousand years. The author has certainly worked conscientiously through the English translation given in the six volumes of the *Ancient Laws of Ireland*, and her general conclusions, supported by a study of comparative legislation, are likely to stand the test of time. In the present state of our knowledge Dr. Bryant's analysis is as good a summary as is possible and is much more complete than that of the late Mr. Ginnell.

But the limitations of such a popular study are also obvious. The Old Irish Laws are even to Irish linguistic experts a book sealed with seven seals. It certainly requires courage and enthusiasm for a person with little or no knowledge of the language to undertake the task of analysing and explaining these ancient juristic enigmas with the aid of the faulty translation given in the published edition. The tentative efforts of O'Donovan and O'Curry, who never had an opportunity of amending their version, were a brilliant piece of pioneer work. But the modern study of Celtic philology and literature was then only in its infancy. Judged by the light of our fuller knowledge the edition of the Laws possesses serious defects—false extensions of contractions, faulty divisions of words, insufficient distinction between ancient text and later glosses. The time has surely come, especially at the present happy juncture of Irish history, for collating the texts of the Laws with the original MSS. and for publishing a complete and critical edition. Professor Thurneysen has made a valuable beginning and it is to be hoped that the Irish Government will soon be in a position to commission him and native Irish scholars to carry out a task which will be of interest not only to the Irish race but to world scholarship.

When Dr. Bryant's work is examined in its technical details it is therefore seen that the premises are not always certain and that her superstructure is sometimes not built on sure foundations. Compare for example Dr. Bryant's exposition on pages 64—74 with Prof. Thurneysen's contribution on the *Cáin Aicillne* in the current number of the *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*. Dr. Bryant's glossary is similarly defective: *Bruigfer* is con-

<sup>1</sup> *Liberty, Order and Law under Native Irish Rule: A Study in the Book of the Ancient Laws of Ireland.* By Sophie Bryant, D.Sc., D.Litt. London: Harding & More. Pp. 399. Price, 25s. 1923.



fused with *Briuga*; *Eneclann* is wrongly derived; the modern equivalents of *Bothach*, *Colpach*, *Samaisc* are incorrect.

Such technicalities apart, Dr. Bryant's work is stimulating and sound. Seeing that she has garnered so much from a faulty translation of a faulty text, what may we not expect when the Laws have been issued in a critical edition worthy of modern scholarship and of the Irish people?

## SHORT NOTICES.

### THEOLOGICAL.

A NEW translation into English of the well-known work of Canon de Smet has just come to hand: *Betrothment and Marriage*, 2nd edition. Vol. I., being a translation from the third Latin edition (1923, pp. 310, with full biography, translated by Rev. W. Dobell, published by Herder, London, W.C.1: price 20s. for both volumes, which cannot be sold separately). The work was favourably noticed in *THE MONTH* November, 1909, p. 556. It has now been revised and brought into conformity with the New Code of Canon Law. Students who are beginning their theological course are fortunate in having such a complete treatment in English of a very difficult subject, and that, from every point of view, dogmatic, canonical, moral and civil. Erudition and research are evident in the notes no less than in the text of every page. The translator's work has been an arduous one and is excellently done. He was well advised, we think, to retain the Latin text in a few passages of greater delicacy, for obviously the subject cannot be adequately treated without going into minute details. Both volumes of the work should be in the hands of every priest, to serve as a very full commentary on the Canons of the Codex and to supplement the texts they used in their theological course.

### BIBLICAL.

Not many words are needed to welcome the seventh edition of a volume of tried worth—*Commentarius in Actus Apostolorum*, by A. Camerlynck, S.T.D., et A. Van der Heeren, S.T.D. (Beyaert: pp. 423). Every help is therein provided for the student that can reasonably be demanded, and he can find quickly whatever he wants. The various questions that arise are treated judiciously, though we notice with regret that the editors are convinced "North Galatians" (p. 290), whereas we have little doubt that the author of the introduction to the Galatian epistle in the *Westminster Version* follows by far the greater probability in adopting the "South Galatian" view. Merely to cite names is misleading; Ramsay has a knowledge and authority in this matter which few, or none, of his critics share. The writers deal with the "We-sections" concisely but efficiently (pp. 26 ff.), and hold that Acts xiii. 3 refers to the episcopal consecration of St. Paul (p. 242). We find that the mention of such points in the table of contents adds greatly to the interest both of text and commentary. There is a special little section of the introduction to show "how useful it is to refer to the Greek text" (p. 61); we

should have preferred to say, to read it, and we should gladly see some further effort by the editors to bring it home to their readers.

#### PHILOSOPHICAL.

One of the characteristics of modern Scholasticism is its ever-increasing adoption of the historical method. Already it has several excellent works on History of Philosophy to its credit. Among these, a high place must be accorded to *La Philosophie Moderne*, by Père Gaston Sortais, S.J., of which the second volume lies before us (Paris: Lethielleux: pp. 584). The subject of this part is the history of Empiricism in England and France in the 17th century; and the scale of the work may be judged from the fact that it devotes the whole of its nearly six hundred closely printed pages to two writers—Pierre Gassendi and Thomas Hobbes. It is a scholarly and well-documented work—the bibliography of Hobbes gives about seventy titles, far more, we think, than his importance as a philosopher warrants. The study of Gassendi should be especially interesting. He is a writer who has been strangely neglected both in his own country and elsewhere, yet we have no doubt he was a greater man, as he certainly was a far more amiable one, than Hobbes. His Atomistic philosophy was in strange contrast with his genuine piety and irreproachable priestly virtue. His theory of morals was a refined Epicureanism. His true talent lay, however, neither in psychology nor ethics, but in the physical sciences; here, many of his criticisms of the still-prevalent Aristotelianism were fully justified.

In his *Introduction to Social Service* (Heath and Co.: \$1.60) the Rev. H. S. Spalding, S.J., is concerned with the principles which should underlie all fruitful service of the community, not with specific methods. He has treated first things first. No profitable social reform can be projected unless the basic facts of reason and faith are taken due account of, and unless the family, the unit of social life, is respected and safeguarded. Father Spalding's book affords a valuable means of testing the various humanitarian projects which a growing sense of the injustices tolerated in our midst has suggested, and a clear indication of the only true lines of remedy.

#### LITURGICAL.

When we opened *Cerimoniale Solemnium Functionum Hebdomadæ Majoris* (Marietti: 18 lire), by Father Aloysius Moretti, we could not but think: Here's just the little book we have been waiting for! An extremely practical work, which ought to save many a priest much time and labour and contribute greatly to a more accurate execution of these sacred functions. This *Cerimoniale*, synopsized by the Master of Ceremonies at St. Mark's, Venice, should prove especially welcome to those who relish crispness, conciseness and clearness in liturgical directions—to those, who like to see at a glance in imagination what takes place at each stage of the ceremony, without having to resort to continuous cross-reference. The general drawing-up of this book of 160 pages is excellent, and the print is large and clear. Each double page is divided into seven columns, the first of which states the part of the function concerned, while the remaining six present side by side the corresponding duties of Celebrant, Deacon, Sub-deacon, Clerus, M.C.; and other ministers (Acolytes, Thurifer, etc.). Here and there, little plans

are inserted, showing the relative positions of the ministers. The busy priest, who has "to get up his part" quickly, will find this book a boon.

## DEVOTIONAL.

Father Raoul Plus, S.J., is already favourably known for his inspiring work, *God in Us*. He approaches, not a different theme, but the same under a different aspect, in his latest book, *In Christ Jesus* (B. O. and W.: 6s.), which has been translated by Mr. Peter Addison. It might be described as a study of the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, the incorporation of all who are God's children by grace in the Mystic Body of Christ. Father Plus treats the matter with great thoroughness and always with a view to its practical exercise. The translation is sometimes wanting in clearness, which cannot be due to any defect in the original.

Miss Judith Smith's catechism instructions, called *Faith and Duty*, have given her a right to be listened to when she writes on matters wherein she has shown she is an expert. The little book of essays, called *The Training of the Will* (B. O. and W.: 1s. net), which she has lately published, is full of acute psychological observation, theories tested and tried in the class-room and become principles of action. We warmly recommend it to all teachers.

The talented authoress of the *Life and Letters of Mother Stuart*, Mother M. Monahan, was compelled by the extent of her material to content herself with only a few indications (beyond the letters themselves) of the literary genius of her subject. She has been well inspired to issue since selections from Mother Stuart's occasional papers, which she calls, after the title of one of the essays, *Highways and By-ways in the Spiritual Life* (Longmans: 6s. net). These papers, we gather, were written for the instruction or amusement of her community, and they exhibit not only a lively fancy and a faculty of keen observation, but also wonderful dexterity in depicting the spiritual side of things. Several of the dramatic pieces might be reproduced at school entertainments, and all are worth reading and pondering.

We believe that the spiritual works of Father Faber already exist in French, but, with the laudable object of making them more familiar, M. l'Abbé L. Jaud has, by dint of omissions and rearrangement, combined three of them—All for Jesus, Growth in Holiness, The Blessed Sacrament—into one volume, disposed for meditation, and called *Œuvres du P. Faber* (Téqui: 7.50 fr.). Other volumes similarly compiled are to follow.

The large and interesting book to which Father E. Garesché gives the title *Sodality Conferences* (Benziger Bros.: \$2.75) has for subject, not the virtues which a Sodality is supposed to implant or develop but the actual material organization and working of such gatherings. It is a very thorough piece of work, dealing with all the historical, as well as the devotional, aspects of the matter, and providing Directors of the Sodality with all that is requisite for the proper understanding of its rules and of the methods advisable for maintaining and extending its spirit. The treatment concerns not only Sodalities proper, *i.e.*, those affiliated to the *Prima Primaria* in Rome, but to all bodies of devout Clients of Our Lady, Children of Mary, etc., that flourish throughout the Catholic world.

With the laudable desire of increasing our knowledge of God's first creation, Father Raphael V. O'Connell, S.J., has written a series of short chapters on **The Holy Angels** (Kenedy and Sons: \$1.50) which, drawing on revelation and theological reasoning, describe the nature and functions of these divine messengers. The author is of course obliged to leave much undecided, but it is surprising how much certain information has been conveyed to us in Holy Writ.

Father Lasance, that energetic compiler of popular Prayer Books has issued in a large-type edition, suitable for reading in dim churches, his well-known **My Prayer Book** (Benziger Bros.: \$2.00), which combines instruction with devotion in a remarkable degree.

A fourth volume of **Father Tim's Talks** (Herder: 4s.), by Father C. D. McEnniry, C.S.S.R., shows no sign of falling off from the high standard set by the previous ones. Here we find the same pungent criticism of abuses and failings peculiar to Catholics, and the same sound exposition of Catholic doctrine and practice, conveyed in the same witty fashion as before. Many a priest-manager, for instance, will read the chapter "Trouble in the Choir" with admiration both of Father Tim's analysis of the trouble and of his courage in applying the remedy.

#### BIOGRAPHY.

The Congregation of the Poor Child Jesus is so far little known in England, where it has only two houses, but **The Life of Mother Clare Fey** (B. O. and W.: 6s.), its foundress, will call attention to it and, perhaps, help to spread its useful work amongst us. The book is a translation and adaptation from larger German lives, and necessarily narrates, not only the fortunes of the Foundress but the growth and expansion of her Institute, which was started at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1844, for the care and education of poor orphans, and which, scattered abroad by the Kulturkampf, has now houses in many foreign lands and covers the whole field of female education. The Archbishop of Birmingham, under whose care is one of the English houses, writes an appreciative preface.

We are pleased to see that an English translation has now appeared of that interesting and inspiring biography of the holy Foundress of the Carmelite Convent at Paray-le-Monial, Mère Marie de Jésus. **A Carmelite of the Sacred Heart** (B.O. and W.: 7s. 6d. net) is the title of the English version of the original French edition, which was fully noticed in our November issue. The present translation is by M. E. Arendrup, and entirely avoids that all too frequent fault of translators, *i.e.*, a slavish literalness. Thus in the present book the "atmosphere," as well as the meaning of the original text, is admirably preserved. The French edition, for some reason, was rather highly priced, and this, no doubt, is reflected in the price of the English.

#### HISTORICAL.

The third volume of the full-dress **History of Mother Seton's Daughters** (Longmans: 16s. net), which Sister Mary Agnes McCann, M.A., Ph.D., has in hand, is devoted to the fortunes of the Sisters of Mercy in Cincinnati, 1809—1923. The talented authoress spreads a wide net, and retails many events of contemporary history which have little reference to her theme, but these only make her pages, laden with the inevitable local statistics and personal estimates, more generally readable.

The devoted labours of two Etonians, Father Ronald Knox and Mr. Shane Leslie, will do much to advance the beatification of Eton's great founder. Their book, **The Miracles of Henry VI.** (Cambridge University Press: 12s. 6d. net), recalls how near its venerated subject, on several occasions, was to beatification, and offers proof from a contemporary document of several of the many miracles wrought through his intercession. The Latin text of the record is given together with a skilful annotated translation by Father Knox, who also provides a critical estimate of the MS., whilst Mr. Leslie narrates the history of Henry's "cause." The book is excellently produced.

## FICTION.

There is little literary skill in **The Starlight of the Hills** (Herder: 7s. 6d. net), and the moral, excellent though it is, is not merely insinuated but emphasized and underscored from the first page to the last. Yet in spite of the angular movements of the marionettes and the bookish talk that is put into their mouths, there is much pleasing description of Kentucky scenery and sufficient incident in the plot to make one read to the end, which represents the triumph of Christian principles over Socialism.

The art which conceals art is not conspicuous in **The Winter of Discontent** (Kenedy and Sons: \$2.00), by Father James Francis Barrett, which is a novel with the purpose of showing up the causes which provoke the sinful and unsatisfactory remedy of divorce. There is a deal of excellent instruction on the true nature of marriage, which the Catholics concerned should not have needed, but the information is somewhat out of place in its surroundings. Yet the tale is readable enough and is filled with admirable descriptions of American scenery.

We do not wonder that **A Knight of God**, by Edith M. Power (Sands: 3s. 6d. net), should have run into a second impression, for it is a story of unusual merit concerning penal times, told with great delicacy and power.

A thoroughly well-written and well-constructed story of American newspaper life, written by Will Scarlet, and called **False Gods** (Benziger Bros.: \$2.00), conveys a very useful lesson to young intellectuals who are tempted to "outgrow" the divine wisdom of Catholicism. The writer is evidently both a thinker and a man of experience, and the two qualities are admirably blended in his book.

A most effective "jacket," representing a skeleton embracing a burst sack of doubloons, gives the cue to the excitement which runs through **Double-Eagles** (Herder: 6s. net), by Father Mark Gross, S.J. It is a capital story of sport and adventure on the Missouri, involving hair-breadth escapes and moving accidents, and ending happily.

## POETRY.

The musical composer who sets words to music is proverbially a person bound on a forlorn quest, the ideal lyric being a thing difficult to discover. Mr. J. M. Stuart-Young has taken the matter in hand in a manner which gives the lie to the charge that the poets are an unpractical race. He has provided a couple of volumes containing lyrics suitable to all moods and all occasions and offered them to the composer, in one case under the frank title of "Who buys my dreams?" This collec-

tion is prefaced by a foreword explaining its aims and claims in a manner as amusing as it is disarming. Amongst "Lyricists," as Mr. Stuart-Young terms his fraternity, the author of "**Who buys my dreams?**" and **Minor Melodies** (Cecil Palmer: the latter 10s. 6d.) should occupy a unique position for the facility of his rhyme and rhythm, and the abundance of happy thoughts that he gives expression to in verse is quite phenomenal.

A simple little morality play, aptly conceived and well executed, has been called **Via Vitæ** (Milford: 2s. net), by the talented Sister of Charity who wrote it, and represents the journey of the Soul through life, protected by Faith, Hope and Charity, from the assaults of the World, the Flesh and the Devil. It should make an excellent little drama for schools and its songs have been set to music.

**A Prayer to Little Jesus** (Sands: 1s. net) is a charming rhyme by Sister M. Antony, charmingly illustrated by Sister Tarcisius, and very neatly produced by the publishers.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

In a pleasant gossip fashion, the same hand who gave us not long ago, in *Pastor Halloft*, a sketch of the ideal Catholic priest working in American surroundings, now in **An ex-Prelate's Meditations** (Longmans: 7s. 6d. net) traces the various directions in which the clergy may fall short in the exercise of their high calling. No cleric can fail to profit by Dr. Heuser's humorous and kindly, if sometimes candid and caustic, comments on the priestly character under different aspects.

Mr. A. J. Brown has aptly called his gossip book of travels—**A Joyous Entry into Brighter Belgium** (Simkin and Co.: 3s. 6d. net)—for the spirit of pleasure pervades it and invests even *contretemps* of various kinds with humour. A capital book to take with one on a tour, and excellently illustrated with photogravures.

#### MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The New Edition of the **Guide to Westminster Cathedral** (Tablet Office: 1s.) gives in comparatively brief space, aided by capital illustrations, a full account of the origin, history and present state of that great church, the erection of which in the space of seven years was a triumph of building, and the adornment of which has proceeded unceasingly, since its opening about 20 years ago.

**The Catholic Mind** (America Press: 5 cents) continues its useful collection of doctrinal and apologetic articles from the current press. We have before us eight fortnightly issues from October to January. Amongst subjects dealt with are the School Question (October 8th and November 22nd), The Catholic Church (October 22nd and December 22nd), The Mass (November 8th), The Bible (December 8th), Foreign Missions (January 8th). It should be noted that this valuable periodical can be got from the C.T.S. Bookshop in Victoria Street.

Steadily if slowly the C.T.S. is adding to its catalogue and repairing the effects of the lean years during and since the war. "M. E. Francis" has contributed several of her excellent stories grouped together in two 2d. pamphlets, **The Little Jew Girl** and **The Christmas Card**. Miss E. F. Kelly has also, in a pamphlet called **At Christmastide**, published



some very readable tales. An inspiring record of missionary and educational work is contained in *The Sisters of Jesus and Mary in India*, which narrates the history of this flourishing congregation there from 1842 to the present day. *The Holy Infancy* is a reprint of one section of Father Richard Clarke's popular meditations. We are glad to see that the C.T.S. is adopting brighter and more artistic covers for these two-penny pamphlets.

*The Claver Almanac (1924) for the African Missions* (St. Mary's Priory, Princethorpe: 1s.) is full of interesting stories and capital pictures. We do not find, however, any indication of the number and situation of the particular African missions for which the Claver Society is organized.

A pleasing and edifying account of *Marguerite Bosco* (Téqui: 1.00 fr.), the mother of the famous Dom Bosco, has been written by Mgr. de la Porte. More may be found about this saintly woman in *Les Idées pédagogiques de Dom Bosco* (Lethielleux: 1.50 fr.), by M. L. Breckk, which begins with a biographical notice of its subject, and proceeds to a detailed account of the system by which Dom Bosco wrought such great and lasting good in Catholic education.

Madame Cecilia, in the preface to her *Reference Catalogue of Selected Works of Wholesome Fiction* (B.O. and W.: 1s.), anticipates the obvious criticism which the breadth of her selection provokes by dividing her recommendations into three classes, one of which is formed by readers of "more mature judgment." This explains the presence on the list of certain books and authors that one would not at first sight call "wholesome." In the hands of a prudent librarian the catalogue should prove very useful.

A clear and vigorous defence of the war-policy of the late Pope has been translated by J. C. Burns from the French of M. Van den Heuvel, late Belgian Minister to the Vatican, and published under the title, *The Statesmanship of Benedict XV.* (B.O. and W.: 6d. net). It aims at vindicating the Pope from the charge of partizanship and of not denouncing, as he ought, the atrocities of the war; and it succeeds in its aim.

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

**BENZIGER BROS., New York.**

*False Gods.* By W. Scarlet. Pp. 302. Price, \$2.00. *Our Nuns.* By D. A. Lord, S.J. Pp. 280. Price, \$1.75.

**BRUCE PUBLISHING CO., Milwaukee.**

*Great Christian Artists.* Edited by E. J. Garesché, S.J. Illustrated. Pp. 209. Price, \$3.50.

**BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE,**  
London,

*The Life of Blessed Thérèse in Pictures.* Pp. 69. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *Life of*

*the Ven. Philip Howard.* Pp. 38. Price, 1s. *Venial Sin.* By Bishop John Vaughan. Pp. xii. 92. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *Contra Gentiles.* Books I. (x. 214) and II. (ix. 305). Translated by Dominican Fathers. Price, 12s. each. *Tyburn and the English Martyrs.* By Dom Bede Camm. Third edition. Pp. xxvi. 145. Price, 1s. 6d. paper. *Guide in a Catholic Church for Non-Catholics.* By L. W. Fox. Fourth edition. Pp. viii. 81. Price, 6d. *On Miracles and other Matters.* By

- Sir B. Windle. Pp. vii. 186. Price, 6s.
- COLDWELL, London.  
*The Ordinary of the Holy Mass. From the Missal of Dom Gaspar Lefebvre, O.S.B.* Pp. 64. Price, 6d.
- GABALDA, Paris.  
*Les Vertus Théologiques.* By Abbé J. Biard. Pp. 235. Price, 7.00 fr.
- HERDER, London.  
*Double-Eagles.* By M. Gross, S.J. Pp. 299. Price, 6s. *A First Book in Ethics.* By H. Woods, S.J. Pp. v. 295. Price, 9s. n. *Holiness of Life* (St. Bonaventure). Edited by Fr. Wilfrid, O.F.M. Pp. 144. Price, 3s. 6d. *Manual of Neo-Scholastic Philosophy.* By Rev. C. R. Baschab. Pp. 470. Price, 10s. *A Divine Friend.* Pp. 142. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *The Courage of Christ.* Pp. 127. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *The Sacrament of Friendship.* Pp. 218. Price, 5s. n. *The Obedience of Christ.* Pp. 139. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *The Charity of Christ.* Pp. 177. Price, 3s. 6d. n. All by H. C. Schuyler, S.T.L. *Flowers of the Sanctuary.* By Rev. F. A. Reuter. Pp. 228. Price, 5s. n. *Catechism of the Council of Trent.* Translated and annotated by J. A. McHugh, O.P., and C. J. Callan, O.P. Pp. lv. 603. Price, 20s. n. *Concordance of Proper Names in H.S.* By Rev. T. D. Williams. Pp. 1060. Price, 25s. n.
- HERDER, Freiburg.  
*Von Seele zu Seele.* By P. Lippert, S.J. Pp. iii. 256. Price, 4.75 fr. *Heiligen Verehrung.* By Dr. E. Nied. Pp. viii. 110. Price, 1.90 fr.
- H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE, London.  
*Catalogue of MSS., etc. in P.R.O.* 10th Edit. Edited by Sir H. C. Maxwell Lyte. Pp. 77. Price, 1s.
- KEGAN, PAUL & CO., London.  
*Lacordaire's Political and Social Philosophy.* Edited by Rev. D. O'Mahony. Pp. xvi. 247. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *Panegyrics of the Saints.* From Bossuet and Bourdaloue. Edited by the same. Pp. xxiii. 249. Price, 10s. 6d. n.
- LETHIELLEUX, Paris.  
*Soyez Joyeux.* From the Italian of Fr. Fachinetti, O.F.M. By l'Abbé Ph. Mazoyer. Pp. xlv. 304. Price, 7.50 fr. *Formation Chrétienne de l'Âme.* 1<sup>re</sup> Série. By Abbé P. Boumard. Pp. 264. Price, 5.00 fr.
- LONGMANS, London.  
*The Life Purposeful.* By the Rev. Jesse Brett. Pp. ix. 146. Price, 5s. n. *Authority and Freedom.* By Rev. A. E. Rawlinson. Pp. xi. 189. Price, 7s. 6d. n. *Road-mending on the Sacred Way.* By Rev. J. Crum. Pp. xii. 179. Price, 6s. n. *A Daughter of Coventry Patmore.* By a Religious of the H.C.J. Pp. xv. 200. Price, 7s. 6d. *Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity.* By Canon O. C. Quick. Pp. ix. 118. Price, 6s. n. *An Anglo-Catholic's Thoughts on Religion.* By Rev. G. C. Rawlinson. Edited by W. J. Sparrow Simpson. Pp. xlviii. 206. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- MUSEUM LESSIANUM, Louvain.  
*La Prière de Toutes les Heures.* III. By P. Charles, S.J. Pp. 168. Price, 5.00 fr.
- ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, Rome.  
*Conceptus de Ecclesia juxta Orientales.* By Th. Spáčil, S.J. Pp. 96. Price, 8.00 fr.
- SANDS & CO., London.  
*St. Colette and her Reform.* Translated from the French by Mrs. Conor Maguire. Pp. 352.
- S.P.C.K., London.  
*Healing.* By the Rev. M. R. Newbolt. Pp. 96. Price, 2s. n. *Sources for the History of the (Privy) Council.* By E. R. Adair. Pp. 96. Price, 3s. 6d. n. *St. Antony.* By W. K. Lowther Clarke. Price, 2d.
- TABLET HOUSE, London.  
*Westminster Cathedral.* Pp. 48. Price, 1s.
- TALBOT PRESS, Dublin.  
*The Life of St. Gregory the Great.* By a Sister of Notre Dame. Pp. 258. Price, 5s. n. *The Angel of the Eucharist.* By Sister Mary Bernard. Pp. 110. Price, 2s. 6d. n.
- STOCKWELL, London.  
*The Historical Truth of Genesis.* By W. Lowndes, M.A. Pp. Price, 7s. 6d. n. *Ancient Hebrew Theories.* By Juridicus. Pp. 70. Price, 4s. n.
- TÉQUI, Paris.  
*L'Esthétique du Stabat.* By Cardinal N. Marini. Illustrated. Pp. xxii. 182. Price, 10.00 fr. *Le Directeur du Prêtre.* By B. Valéry, S.J. Pp. 253. Price, 7.00 fr. *Dans la Chambre du Malade.* By Canon S. Decorne. Pp. xi. 253. Price, 7.00 fr. *Henri Planchat.* By M. Maignen. Pp. vi. 232. Price, 6.00 fr.

